The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXXIII October 1959 Number Four

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 266

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF HANS HUT (*Part II*) 267
Herbert Klassen

HUTTERITES REVISIT EUROPEAN HOMSTEADS: FROM THE DIARY OF DAVID HOFER 305
Robert Friedmann

MENNO SIMONS AND THE ROLE OF BAPTISM IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE 323
Vincent G. Harding

CHRISTIAN NONCONFORMITY IN A CONFORMIST AGE 335
Lloyd L. Ramseyer

RESEARCH NOTES 347

Joachim Helm's Letter Concerning Anabaptists
William Klassen

Jantz-Jontzen-Johnson-Yontz and Smith
Melvin Gingerich

BOOK REVIEWS 349

Studies in Church Discipline
Reviewed by John C. Wenger

Stanislaus Kot, *Socinianism in Poland: The Social and Political Ideas of the Polish Antitrinitarians in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*
Reviewed by Robert Friedmann

Charles Pierre Peguy, *Temporal and Eternal*
Reviewed by Paul Peachey

Robert Collinet, *Histoire du Protestantisme en Belgique aux xvii*^{me} *et xviii*^{me} *siecles*
Reviewed by John H. Yoder

Ekkehard Krajewski, *Leben und Sterben des Zürcher Täuferführers Felix Mantz*
Reviewed by Hans J. Hillerbrand

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIII, 1959 358

EDITORIAL

THE PROPER ASSESSMENT OF THE FORCES AND IDEAS WHICH FORMED CENTRAL European Anabaptism in the creative period 1525-1535 requires a thorough analysis of every personality and each writing which appeared during this time. It has long been clear that Hans Hut was an important figure in the earliest days of the movement, but his teachings, their provenance, and their influence had never been definitively studied. That Herbert Klassen has come close to a final account of Hut's contribution is clear from the second and final part of his study which is presented in this issue of the REVIEW. The literary evidence is scanty, and at some points ambiguous, but the main outlines are clear. Hut's teachings on the church, baptism, discipleship, discipline, the state, etc., are clear. Only on the oath does he deviate from the main Anabaptist line. A true man of the people, with little education, he nevertheless stands out as an original mind, with unusual capacity to win others to his views, and boundless courage. A short sixteen months of active ministry was all that was allotted to him, but it was enough to stamp him as probably next to Sattler the single most influential Anabaptist leader in 1526-1527, certainly exceeding Hans Denck. His legacy is to be found criefly in the Marpeck group and the Hutterites.

ROBERT FRIEDMANN HAS GIVEN US AN INTENSELY INTERESTING ACCOUNT OF THE remnants of the old Hutterite settlements in Moravia and Transylvania as seen through the eyes of the modern Hutterites who revisited the old locations in 1937, taken from the travel diary of David Hofer. It is no less than astounding that two hundred fifty years after forcible conversion to Catholicism, identifiable remnants, sociological and material though to be sure, not religious, still survive. Do sociological and cultural items persist better than religious and spiritual elements?

NO OTHER ANABAPTIST WROTE SO MUCH AND SO VIGOROUSLY AND CLEARLY ON baptism as Menno Simons. Vincent Harding has clearly delineated Menno's theology of baptism in his article which appears in this issue. Central for Menn is the emphasis upon man's own radical commitment in the repentance and obedience which baptism symbolizes. It is the continuing new life that Menno wants, and this is possible only when, in addition to the gracious work of God through the Holy Spirit, man puts his own will into full action.

PRESIDENT RAMSEYER'S BACCALAUREATE SERMON, "CHRISTIAN NONCONFORMITY in a Conformist Age," makes this essential idea in the Christian faith thoroughly relevant to the modern age. Clear, penetrating, and presented with deep conviction, it is a summons to life and action based upon a good understanding of the meaning of discipleship and the perils which threaten Christians in a "conformist age."

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF HANS HUT

PART II

HERBERT KLASSEN*

III. HANS HUT AND THOMAS MÜNTZER

In order to trace and discuss the influence of Thomas Müntzer on Hans Hut it will be necessary to trace their actual contacts in life and to study and compare their teachings. There are no references or even allusions to Hut in Müntzer's letters and writings,[1] but during Hut's trials he was repeatedly asked about his relationship to Müntzer and from his confessions their encounters in life can be traced.

A. CONTACTS IN LIFE

The relationship began with Müntzer's visit to Hut in Bibra for a night and a day sometime during the summer of 1524.[2] Because Hut was acquainted with the book trade, Müntzer left with him the manuscript of a book to be printed. This book was a commentary on the first chapter of Luke which Müntzer wrote toward the end of

* Herbert Klassen did his master's thesis at the Univesity of British Colunmbia on "Some Aspects of the Teachings of Hans Hut (c. 1490-1527)." His home is Clearbrook, British Columbia, and not Manitoba as was erroneously reported in the previous issue.

1 His major tracts appear in modernized German in Otto H. Brandt, *Thomas Muentzer, Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Jena, 1933), and his letters in H. Böhmer and P. Kirn, *Thomas Muentzers Briefwechsel* (Leipzig, 1931). Müntzer's last three and most important writings have been edited in a critical edition by Carl Hinrichs, *Thomas Muentzer. Politische Schriften mit Kommentar* (Halle, 1950). A translation of Müntzer's Sermon Before the Princes appears in George H. Williams, *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (Philadelphia, 1957), pp. 47-70 (The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXV). Three of the most useful studies on Müntzer are Karl Holl, "Luther und die Schwärmer," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, I (Tübingen, 1923); Annemarie Lohmann, *Zur geistigen Entwicklung Thomas Muentzers* (Leipzig, 1931); and Carl Hinrichs, *Luther und Muentzer. Ihre Auseinandersetzung über Obrigkeit und Widerstandsrecht* (Berlin, 1952). Some of the above include extensive bibliographies.

2 *Confessions*, p. 243.

June 1524 and submitted with few changes to the censors on August 1. He took the original along to Mühlhausen, reworked it, and on his flight from Mühlhausen to Nürnberg, left it with Hut in Bibra.[3]

Although Hut denied it in his confessions, there might have been some relationship between the two previous to this visit. Since Müntzer was always very eager to see his writings in print, it is difficult to imagine that he would have left his commentary with Hut if they had not known each other previously. Since Hut was willing to accept the risk involved in having it published he must have had a certain amount of sympathy for the cause that Müntzer represented. Both of them had travelled rather widely in Saxony, Franconia, and beyond, in the years after 1521, so it is possible that they knew one another. Because they both refused to accept the *status quo* and took an interest in Luther and the dissemination of radical ideas, it is conceivable that they were friends.

The only other known contact between Hut and Müntzer took place the following May at the Battle of Frankenhausen in the Peasants' War. Hut was on his way from Wittenberg to Erfurt, and hearing of the troubles at Frankenhausen he went there with the hope of selling books.[4] After arrival he was taken captive but released at the command of Müntzer. On May 16, the fateful day for the peasants, Hut also made his way up the hill, but the shooting became too thick for him and he fled. In Frankenhausen he was taken captive by the Hessian troops, and although some of the prisoners were beheaded, he was released.[5]

The Sunday before this battle Hut heard Müntzer preach publicly in Frankenhausen. He summarizes his impression of Müntzer's sermon as follows:

> God almighty now desires to cleanse the world, so He has taken the power from the authorities and is giving it to the subjects. The authorities are becoming weak and in their weakness they will plead with the subjects, but they [subjects] should not accept this in faith, for the authorities themselves have not kept faith. God is on the side of the subjects. On every small flag the peasants carried they had drawn a rainbow. Müntzer picked up this symbol and said that it was a sign of the covenant that God had made with them. Müntzer preached to the masses on three days previous to the battle and each day a rainbow appeared in the sky. Müntzer told them that this rainbow was a covenant and sign to show them that God was with them. All they must now do is fight heartily and be bold.[6]

Hut adds that he also saw the rainbow.

Hut returned to Bibra and preached in much the same spirit as Müntzer: "The subjects should murder all the authorities, for the

3 Brandt, p. 243.
4 *Confessions*, p. 239.
5 *Ibid.*, 239, 241.
6 *Ibid.*, 241.

opportune time has arrived, the power is in their hands."[7] It is because of this kind of preaching that Hut has been condemned as a disciple and follower of Thomas Müntzer. A list of accusations in the sources illustrates this: "Because he has referred to Müntzer and those from Mühlhausen in his tract, we consider him to be one of Müntzer's sect with the intention of establishing it."[8] The accusations directed at Hut are no different from those that could be directed against Müntzer.

It is on the basis of these accusations that Hut has been accepted as a disciple of Müntzer and that Heinrich Bullinger[9] and his partisans down to Boehmer[10] and Holl[11] have claimed Müntzer to be the father of the Anabaptist movement. Since the only way in which Müntzer could have been the father of the Anabaptist movement would have been through Hut, it is important to study the relationship between these two men.[12]

Hut did acknowledge the two mentioned encounters with Müntzer but he also said more. After describing Müntzer's first visit to him he said that he was not one of Müntzer's sect, and though he had heard him preach a number of times he had not really been able to comprehend him.[13] He probably said this in light of the change that later took place in his life. When he heard Müntzer preach death to the authorities and the cleansing of the world by God, he said that he really believed God was backing the war, and that the time had come for the fulfillment of the events as Müntzer described them.[14] But they did not materialize, and since then his attitude had changed, "He has been told and taught other things."[15] This is probably a reference to his baptism and identification with the Anabaptist movement.

Hut's preaching in Bibra just after the Peasants' Revolt assumed that the cause of the peasants was a righteous one, but in a sermon preached at Königsberg after his baptism he said outspokenly that the peasants were in error, that they had been seeking their own honor and not God's.[16] He had formerly said that the Christians must murder the authorities, but now he said that no Christian should take the sword out of its sheath until God bids him do so.

7 *Ibid.*
8 *Ibid.*, 244.
9 Bullinger, 1a-8a.
10 Heinrich Böhmer, "Thomas Muentzer und das jüngste Deutschland," *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Gotha, 1927) p. 221.
11 Holl, pp. 423-425.
12 The only attempt has been made by Robert Friedmann, "Thomas Muentzer's Relation to Anabaptism," *MQR* XXXI (1957) pp. 81-82.
13 *Confessions*, p. 243.
14 *Ibid.*, p. 251.
15 *Ibid.*
16 *Ibid.*, p. 241.

Whereas he previously thought that the time was opportune for revolution and overthrow, now he said that God would initiate the Day of the Lord and the fulfillment of His Kingdom.[17]

If the *Geschicht-Buch*[18] of the Hutterian Brethren, the *Kunstbuch*[19] of the South German Anabaptists, and the *Martyrs' Mirror*[20] accept Hut as a peaceful Anabaptist and faithful martyr, what is the relationship between his teaching and that of Müntzer? The contradiction between the claims of his accusers and his own testimony can only be probed by a comparison of their writings and by a study of their influence upon their friends and associates.

A study of the writings of Hut and Müntzer shows some relationship and similarity between them. The problem, however, is not solved by this discovery. The unique words and phrases[21] that are repeated and the parallel concepts and ideas will now be examined in the light of their attitudes to church and state.

B. The Church

The concept of the church is probably the key to the difference between Hut and Müntzer. Müntzer had a rather vague concept of the renewal of Christendom by the immediate intervention of God assisted by the armies of the faithful. Hut worked in terms of local fellowships and the spread of the brotherhood until Christ would return. On the other hand, the goal that controlled Müntzer's view of the church was the erection of the Kingdom of God by force. This is not clearly stated in the Prague Manifesto[22] of 1521, but by 1524 his revolutionary principle was crystallized. Müntzer began his religious activities as a moderate and ended as a radical, whereas Hut began as a radical and made his major contribution as a moderate. A comparison of a number of key concepts from the last year of each man's life will illustrate this.

1. *Covenant and Baptism*

The first writing by Müntzer that gives any light on his concept of the nature of the covenant was the letter to Schösser on July 25, 1524.[23] According to this letter, outwardly the covenant is a sign of the union of the individual with God and at the same time it is a

17 *Ibid.*, p. 242.
18 Beck, p. 22.
19 *Kunstbuch*, pp. 42-55. This is a slightly revised edition of Hut's tract on the mysteries of baptism.
20 Van Braght, p. 433.
21 A number of these have been listed in Grete Mecenseffy, "Die Herkunft des oberösterreichischen Täufertums," *ARG* 47, Heft 2 (1957) pp. 257-258. A few examples are: Creatur, Bruder Sanftleben, die zarten Schriftgelehrten, die Verwerfung des falschen und ertichten Glaubens, Gelassenheit, as well as the concept of experiencing suffering and affliction in order to come to faith in God.
22 Böhmer and Kirn, 139-159.
23 *Ibid.*, p. 74 f.

covenant among believers to encourage prophecy and new relation. Everyone interested was invited to join the covenant, and its purpose was expressed as the punishment of those who opposed it.[24] Beyond this the covenant was essentially a form of self-protection (*Notwehr*).[25] Although the duties of the covenant were both spiritual and political Müntzer was quick to insist that its essence was spiritual. It becomes clear, however, in his later writings that the revolutionary purpose of the covenant stands in contradiction to the ideal of despair and resignation instilled by the cross.

The rainbow on the banners of the peasants was the only sign of the covenant of God to which Müntzer referred.[26] This is an example of Müntzer's belief in new revelations. Neither baptism nor any other biblical sign is needed to confirm the new covenant if God grants a new revelation.

The practical manifestations of the covenant as they were developed by Müntzer in Mühlhausen and Allstedt are better described as a secret society or conspiracy than a church. The fact that the covenant was immediately dissolved when the peasants were defeated and their leader killed is a testimony to the fact that it was more political than spiritual. The covenant had been established to found the Kingdom of God by force, but when God refrained from intervening on behalf of Müntzer with the peasants in the war, the covenant became inoperative by definition; one partner had not kept faith. Müntzer's covenant was more like that between an army and its leaders. If the army had been victorious the reign of the leader would have begun. Müntzer staked not only his life but also his theology on the success of the troops at Frankenhausen, and when they failed, his whole system of teaching, including what he had to say about the Christian life and the church, were shown to be bankrupt.

Hut's concept of the covenant, on the other hand, had a completely different orientation. Even though it is possible that Hut first heard the word from Müntzer and adopted the concept of a covenant from him, he filled it with new meaning. For Hut the covenant is intimately related to baptism, which is interpreted as an expression of the corporate life of the church-brotherhood. The sign of baptism as a covenant with God is the means whereby the individual becomes a living member of the body of Christ in a local congregation. Baptism as a covenant must take place before a congregation, which, as the body of Christ, can accept the new member into its

24 Lohmann, p. 57.
25 Böhmer and Kirn, p. 76.
26 Brandt, p. 38.

midst. Hut's definition of the covenant is a classic statement of the South German Anabaptist position: "For this covenant is a commitment under obedience to Christ that manifests itself in godly love to all brothers and sisters with body, life, property, and honor, regardless of the criticisms of the world."[27] Baptism as the sign of the covenant assured the believer that he was an accepted child of God and a member of the Christian community on earth.

To Müntzer the purpose of the covenant was to unite brothers against the ungodly; Hut taught that the covenant unites individuals to the body of Christ, to loving membership with one another, and to the missionary task of preaching the Gospel. Müntzer thought the sign of the covenant was the rainbow, a symbol of the fact that God would assist the peasants in slaughtering the ungodly; Hut accepted the sign of believers' baptism, a symbol that the Spirit of God is present among His gathered people.

2. *Community of Goods*

The only statement in Müntzer's writings which has led scholars to believe that he taught community of goods was his confession on the rack, "all things are common" (*omnia sunt communia*).[28] But this, in the light of his further statement that everyone should be given according to his need,[29] is not sufficient basis for accusing Müntzer of teaching communism; Müntzer was also falsely accused of introducing the annihilation of class distinctions, renouncing private property, and supporting the right to equality and freedom for all men, though there is nothing in Müntzer's writings to support these claims. There is, however, a gradual transition in his life from an emphasis on religious reform to social reform. A growing concern for the improvement of the lot of the common man is evident in his writings, even though he did not develop the details.[30] Müntzer staked everything on a successful overthrow of the authorities; after that the consequences could be worked out. It is because of this that he gave so little thought to what he would raise up in the place of the existing authorities and churches.

A theme that is repeated in Müntzer's writings in 1524 is the accusation that the lords had precipitated the crisis in Germany by their greed. The needs and poverty among the common people were understood to be a result of the fact that the nobility had assumed control of everything.

> The old flatterer [Luther] . . . has kept secret the origins of all stealing. He desires to gain the praise of men by spilling blood, for the sake of temporal goods. The ground and source of all gambling,

27 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, p. 20.
28 Brandt, p. 82.
29 *Ibid.*
30 *Ibid.*, p. 30.

> robbery, and stealing lies with the lords and princes. They have taken all created things as their own possessions: the fish of the streams, the birds of the air, and all plant life belongs to them. It is under these circumstances that they warn the poor that God has ordained, thou shalt not steal. This does not help the situation an iota, for if the poor man violates the law in some minor way he must hang. To all this Luther adds his amen. The lords are responsible for the enmity of the common man and they do not want to rid us of the cause of revolution. Under these circumstances conditions will never improve. If to say this means to be revolutionary, then let's begin.[31]

In Müntzer's tract *Die hochverursachte Schutzrede,* the tension between his teaching about the cross and his concern for the temporal needs of the people is quite evident. To begin with, Müntzer advocated the Peasants' Revolt to propagate the Christian faith and to rid society of the ungodly element that was hindering the faith, but to this he added the goal of improving the material status of the common man. Lohmann has pointed out that Müntzer had two diametrically opposed grounds for drawing the sword.[32] On the one hand it was to be done so that the common man might become a Christian and experience the cross; and on the other hand it was to be done to relieve the need of the people, which Müntzer had already accepted as one aspect of the cross.

Whereas Müntzer might have cherished the hope of community of goods as an ideal for society, Hut advocated sharing for the church-brotherhood alone. The difference between these two men centers on their different concepts of the church and the world. Hut worked at the propagation of the Anabaptist brotherhood, advocating sharing as an expression of love and concern for the covenant brother. Müntzer directed his efforts at society at large and drew supporters from the suppressed elements of society. It is very unlikely in the light of this contrast that there was any relationship between Müntzer's one isolated plea for equality and Hut's conviction that even property must be brought under the lordship of Christ in the church.

3. The Cross and Faith

What are the qualifications for membership in the church and what is to characterize the life of the believer? Müntzer's disappointment with Luther centered in the latter's making it too easy for people to take up the faith. He preached the "honey-sweet" Christ and neglected the "bitter" Christ, for he made no mention of "the law, the fear of God, and the severity of Christ."[33] All Luther did was to encourage men to have faith. This cannot issue in anything but a

31 *Ibid.,* p. 192.
32 Lohmann, p. 68.
33 Brandt, p. 129. Cf. Holl, pp. 426-427.

spurious faith. The true path to faith is the cross, but this does not mean only to believe in the cross but to be willing to experience it in body and soul. In pain, suffering, and sorrow man is released from his bondage to created things. When suffering and despair are at their height, the depths of the soul are bared; man stands in fear and trembling before God, hoping against hope. When this happens the Word of the living God springs forth out of the depths of man's own heart. This is the beginning of faith and a sign of the possession of the Spirit.[34]

In the matter of justification Müntzer's mystical view of the cross (*Kreuzesmystik*) replaced any real doctrine of redemption or atonement (*Erlösungsgedanken*).[35] His emphasis on immersion in God and renunciation of the world was a direct result of the influence of Tauler.[36] In reality his advocacy of the spirit of renunciation, self-denial, and resignation was strongly contradicted by his activistic program of violence and destruction. If salvation comes as a result of resignation, his reaction to social need stands in contradiction to his concept of redemption and the cross.[37] This cleavage of the center of his system did not go unnoticed by Müntzer himself. He always maintained that the only way to find knowledge of God was via the cross, but despite this he tried to justify his appeal for resistance by insisting that the authorities of church and state were keeping the common people from gaining access to the Scriptures. This argument never became a satisfactory bridge between his religious convictions on the one hand and his socio-political hopes on the other.[38]

Although there is a similar concern in Hut for a faith that is expressed in suffering and discipleship, his orientation is quite different. Hut understood suffering to be conditioned by obedience to Christ and to the will of God as revealed in the Scriptures. There is no counterpart to Hut's concept of the new birth (*Wiedergeburt*) as a struggle with sin through the whole of life, in the thought of Müntzer. Contrary to Müntzer's extreme individualism and morbid view of suffering, Hut said one goes the way of discipleship together with the other members of the body of Christ—the whole church suffers. The experience of utter despair is not understood by Hut as the welling up of the Word of God from within the soul of the individual, as the mystics described it. Hut had a place for pain, poverty, and misery inflicted from within and without,[39] but this was not contradicted by any opposition by violence to the forces that were responsible for those actions. Hut taught that the Kingdom of God

34 Holl, pp. 428-430.
35 *Ibid.*, pp. 433-444.
36 Brandt, p. 24.
37 Lohmann, p. 60.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
39 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, p. 34.

will be established by God, not by His people, and that salvation is related to the present reign of Christ over His body and not only to the future reign of God over all men.

4. *The Scriptures and the Spirit*

Müntzer gave a high place to the individual's possession of the living Spirit, for he had much more confidence in direct revelation and instruction by the Spirit than Luther and the Anabaptists did. The Word of God is hidden deep in the heart of the individual, and with the entrance of the Spirit it rises up so that the individual becomes convinced that he had the living Word of God in him.[40] This experience assures a man that he is a member of the elect of God.[41] The nature of this experience makes it possible to come to true faith in God without ever having heard or seen the Scriptures.[42] The Scriptures are only a witness to the faith, not the power that calls it into being. Only after the experience does one have the key to the Scriptures with all their mysteries and apparent contradictions.[43] Once one has the Spirit, new revelations in visions and dreams are to be expected.

In the struggle between Luther and the Spiritualists such as Schwenckfeld, Sebastian Franck, and Müntzer, the distinction between outer and inner Word became important. Whereas Luther laid stress on the Scriptures (outer Word), the sacraments, and the Church, the Spiritualists emphasized the inner Word and its manifestations, thereby minimizing the sacraments and the visible church. Both of these two ways by which men have tried to explain the Word that arises out of man as the divine Word of God find a basis in Müntzer.[44] One stream says that the flesh which Christ took on was spiritualized and became heavenly flesh, therefore Christ as the second Adam is drawing mankind up into the realm of the Spirit and the divine. The other stream emphasized the divine light "that lighteth every man coming into the world." This divine spark reflects the original nature of man and is God's point of contact with mankind. Revelation is that moment in a man's life when this spark of the divine is awakened.

Müntzer's view of inspirationism as a direct revelation to the soul of man through visions and dreams was probably a result of the influence of Storch.[45] In his Prague Manifesto he already attacked Luther's view of the Scriptures as the source of faith by saying that one must possess the living Spirit in a way of which Luther was not aware.

40 Holl, p. 430.
41 *Ibid.*, p. 431, footnote 2.
42 Brandt, p. 169.
43 *Ibid.*, p. 131.
44 Holl, pp. 437-438.
45 Brandt, p. 6.

In the light of his spiritualism and inspirationism it is interesting to observe how Müntzer used the Scriptures of Old and New Testaments. Although he rejected them as a source of grace and salvation he did bind himself slavishly to them as the norm for personal ethics and aspects of group life.[46] The law of God which man was to follow he found in the Old Testament rather than in the New. When using examples of men to be followed he rarely referred to Christ and the apostles, but rather to Gideon, Elijah, Jehu, and Joel.[47] This was particularly evident in the late years of his life when he was advocating revolution. In this matter he was a forerunner of the Münsterite leaders and their emphasis on, and imitation of, the Old Testament.

In contrasting Luther's emphasis on the outer Word with Müntzer's on the inner, the Anabaptists are often identified collectively with Müntzer and the Spiritualist position. Wiswedel has attacked this generalization and shown that it is not true for the main line of peaceful Anabaptists.[48] Hut's tract on the Scripture shows that he relates discipleship very closely to the Scriptures, maintaining that the willingness to go the martyr way is a true response to the Word of God, within the context of the brotherhood. For Hut the challenge to go the martyr way and the insight into what this means for the body of Christ are both derived from the Scriptures. Although Hut disagrees with the Reformers in that they take faith too easily, he does not accept Müntzer's alternative. The Spirit works in the heart of a disciple but He does it in relationship to the Word. There will, therefore, not be any new revelations to supersede the Scriptures. At this point the Scriptures are a control on any so-called new revelation, and even the individual's interpretation of the Scriptures is subject to the Church which helps to keep men from the dangers of individualism and fanaticism. The fact that Hut was admonished by his brothers at the Martyr Synod of 1527 in regard to a certain area of his teaching is a good example of this concept. This is the only basis on which a common and unified view of the Scriptures can emerge.

Let us contrast Müntzer and Hut again. The goal for Müntzer was individual direct communion with God based on new revelation; the goal for Hut was communion with God through the Scriptures, supported by the disciplined church. A contradiction arises, according to Hut, when the words that Paul directed at the church are

46 He thought it ungodly to cut one's beard (Lev. 19:2); princes should be hanged, not beheaded (Num. 25:4) (Brandt, p. 28).

47 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

48 Wilhelm Wiswedel, "The Inner and the Outer Word, A Study in the Anabaptist Doctrine of Scripture," *MQR* XXVI (1952) pp. 171-191.

directed by the Reformers at those who are not willing to accept the means that lead into the church, i.e., discipleship and suffering. The contradiction in Müntzer's position arises out of the fact that he spoke of the living Spirit and suffering, but never called for a gathered Church—the goal and context for all true discipleship and suffering.

C. The State

1. *Eschatology and the State*

The difference in the eschatology of Müntzer and Hut is crucial for an understanding of the difference in their attitude to the civil authorities, but since eschatology and the state are so closely related in Müntzer's thought they will be considered together.

Already in 1521 in the Prague Manifesto, Müntzer had said that once all men had been warned, those who remained indifferent would be delivered into the hands of the Turks for destruction. After this the true antichrist would appear but he would be overthrown by Christ who would give the kingdom of this world into the hands of His chosen ones.[49] It was not until the *Fürstenpredigt* and the *Ausgedrückte Entblösung,* both of 1524, that the details and consequences of this view of Müntzer's were worked out.

About March 1524, while Müntzer was in Allstedt, he organized a covenant of the elect (*Bund der Auserwählten*) that originally was made up of about thirty members. Shortly after being organized this revolutionary society undertook its first task; the burning down of a chapel near Allstedt.[50] Soon after this the council and the church of Allstedt joined the covenant and it was then organized on a firm military basis with five covenant leaders headed by Müntzer, and strict orders to all members to be on guard and ready for military action.[51] It was in this setting that Müntzer preached his sermon to the princes on July 13, 1524.

In this sermon his eschatology and attitude to the civil authorities are further developed. His program was first of all to include an invitation to the princes to join the covenant.[52] If they refused, the sword would be taken from them and given to the people. It seems that Müntzer never counted too strongly on their assent, for his revolutionary program based on the support of the peasants was fairly fixed by June 1524.[53]

Müntzer's view of church history came to the support of his position; namely, that the early church was pure only until the end

49 Böhmer and Kirn, p. 150.
50 Hinrichs, *Luther und Muentzer,* p. 12.
51 Ibid., p. 18.
52 Williams, p. 68.
53 Hinrichs, p. 25.

of the apostolic period. The change for the worse took place primarily as a result of political and social factors. As long as the church was pure it was democratic and socialistic. With the development of a hierarchy and authoritarianism the purity left the church.[54]

Müntzer brought all these factors to a climax in his sermon by choosing as his text the second chapter of Daniel, which lent itself easily to his eschatological-dialectical position and its relationship to political-revolutionary action; His aim was to justify revolutionary resistance to the authorities. In his interpretation of the passage, Christ was the mountain from which the stone—the living Spirit—was taken to shatter the four kingdoms. The unbiblical mixture of church and state that had lasted to his own day made up a fifth epoch that must also be shattered by the living Spirit. This was a challenge to those who possessed the Spirit in his day to join the covenant that was dedicated to destroying the ungodly. Since the fall of the church it has been primarily the princes and authorities who had hindered the work of the "stone," so it was they who must be invited to join the covenant, and if they were unwilling they must be destroyed.[55]

2. *Government*

Müntzer traced the origins of government back to the time of Samuel, when the people rejected God and asked for a king. God in His anger granted them a king and instituted civil authority, but in the sixteenth century God in His bitterness was going to annihilate the authorities and set up His own rule once more.[56] In its origins, therefore, civil authority was evil and godless. In order for the true faith to break through, all princely authority would have to be wiped out.

The true purpose and responsibility of the government, according to Müntzer, was to cut off and do away with those who were resisting God. If the government does this it is a servant of God. If the civil authorities do not do this and resist the revelation of God (his own, for example) they must be destroyed as Hezekiah, Josiah, Cyrus, and Daniel did away with their enemies and as Elijah did away with the priests of Baal.[57] It is quite clear from his writings that Müntzer thought of himself as the new Daniel to lead the new revolution against the ungodly.[58] Everyone was welcome to join the covenant of the elect to accomplish this task. Müntzer probably hoped that all those who joined him would be men who had experienced utter despair and possessed the living Spirit, but since his league was

54 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
55 *Ibid.*, p. 46-47.
56 *Ibid.*, p. 11.
57 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
58 *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 64, 68, 118.

not a disciplined church he had no means of implementing this. From the *Ausgedrückte Entblösung,* it becomes clear that the Covenant of the Elect was more like a secret society dedicated to revolutionary purposes than a church, for the true church will only come into existence when the elect are separated from the ungodly in the final apocalyptic-revolutionary event.

3. *Comparison and Contrast*

A crucial difference between Hut and Müntzer grows out of their differing views of the great Judgment. According to Müntzer it is a temporal-historic event, even though it brings all previous history to an end. On this final Day of the Lord, the elect of the new faith will annihilate the ungodly and thereby bring into existence the right Christian church. Müntzer considered the final judgment, therefore, to be identical to the revolution that he was bringing to pass. This comes close to making himself equal to God, and it is at this point that he was opposed by the Reformers and the Anabaptists. The latter, including Hut, maintained that the judgment would take place after Christ returned, and that God would do the judging.

An important difference between Hut and Müntzer rests in the fact that Hut said the members of the church of Christ must suffer on earth until Christ returns, whereas Müntzer taught that the elect should unite to destroy the ungodly, then Christ would return. Hut and Luther, though quite different, did make a place for the church and the state in this present life. Luther was convinced they could co-operate; Hut thought the one must suffer under the other; but Müntzer saw them as absolutely irreconcilable. The two can only exist together until the elect are sufficiently organized to wipe out the others. This type of thought is based on the presupposition that the world must suddenly come to an end. It made no allowance for an intermediate period. If the end does not come the whole system is doomed to failure, as Müntzer and the Münsterites were forced to experience. Hut, however, in giving up his revolutionary position, in identifying himself with a suffering church on earth, and in allowing it to modify his eschatology, become a partner in the founding of the free church movement.

Holl may be right when he says that the concept of voluntary religious association can be found in Müntzer,[59] but the means by which one becomes a part of the group, and the purpose for which one joins it, are so different from Hut's concept of the church that any other similarity is meaningless. Historically Hut and Müntzer were partners in the Left Wing of the Reformation, but when Hut

59 Holl, p. 452.

joined the Anabaptist movement a year after Müntzer's death, there was clearly no significant bearing of Müntzer's influence upon the origins or the character of the South German Anabaptist movement.

IV. Hans Hut and Hans Denck

The similarities between Hut and Müntzer are found primarily in areas of little consquence, whereas in the crucial matters of church and state there is very little similarity between them. In comparing Hut and Denck[60] the opposite seems true. In the crucial questions of church and state there is significant agreement between the two, whereas in many other areas they represent two different approaches to Christian life and thought.

A. Contacts in Life

There were three major contacts between Hut and Denck: the first in Nürnberg in the fall of 1524, before either was an Anabaptist; the second at the time Denck baptized Hut in Augsburg in May 1526; the third during the Marytr Synod in Augsburg in August 1527.

Very little is known about the details of the first meeting. It took place after Hut's encounter with the three craftsmen,[61] which had resulted in his rejection of infant baptism and his expulsion from Bibra because of his refusal to baptize his child. It was probably in July 1524 that Hut had Müntzer's commentary on the first chapter of Luke published in Nürnberg.[62] Between Müntzer's visit to Denck in September 1524 and Denck's expulsion from Nürnberg in January 1525 Hut visited Denck a number of times in Nürnberg. Hut says that he was Denck's guest while he bound books in Nürnberg, but that he also stayed at other homes and practiced other trades.[63]

During the summer and fall of 1524 Denck was influenced most strongly in his opposition to Luther by the humanists of Nürnberg. Two dialogues of Hans Sachs were published at this time which asserted that no Christianity was possible without an imitation of Christ, and that no reformation could be achieved by merely changing external forms; complete resignation to the will of God was

60 The writings of Hans Denck have recently been published in an excellent edition by Walter Fellmann, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer*, Vol. VI, Part II, *Hans Denck Schriften* (Gütersloh, 1956) *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* XXIV. Part I is a bibliography of Denck's writings prepared by Georg Baring. The most recent study of Denck was made by Jan J. Kiwiet, "The Life of Hans Denck," *MQR* XXXI (1957), pp. 227-259; and *idem*, "The Theology of Hans Denck," *MQR* XXXII (1958), pp. -327. A study has been done by the British scholar Alfred Coutts, *Hans Denck (1495-1527): Humanist and Heretic* (Edinburgh, 1927). The classic study on Denck is that of Ludwig Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer* (Leipzig, 1882). A very useful sketch of his life with a comprehensive bibliography, by Christian Neff and Walter Fellmann, appears in *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, ed. Harold S. Bender, Vol. II (1956).

61 *Confessions*, p. 223.

62 Brandt, 243.

63 *Confessions*, pp. 224, 229, 230.

necessary. These themes, also central in Denck's thought, probably exerted considerable influence on him in these months.[64] The opposition to Luther in Nürnberg was stimulated from the outside by a visit of Müntzer in September 1524. However, no significant influence of Müntzer on Denck is evident, either in his confession of January 1525 or in his later writings. The allusions to Müntzer's writings that Fellmann has found in Denck are of little consequence;[65] they might indicate at most that Denck and others in Nürnberg read the published works of Müntzer, possibly in the fall of 1524. Neither Müntzer's reliance on inner revelation through dreams, visions, and ecstasies, nor his radical chiliastic teaching, nor his insistence on realizing the kingdom by force, is reflected anywhere in Denck.

A follower of Carlstadt, Martin Reinhard, appeared in Nürnberg in November 1524 and stirred up discussion on the bread and wine in the Supper. Along with these disturbances the sermons of Tauler and the *Theologia Deutsch*[66] were being studied. These troubles culminated in the case of the three "ungodly" craftsmen (painters) in which Denck became involved. After a number of hearings, for which Denck wrote a confession[67] concerning the Scriptures, sin, righteousness of God, law, Gospel, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, he was finally expelled from the city on January 1, 1525.

This was the atmosphere into which Hut entered when he visited Denck in Nürnberg in the fall of 1524. Apparently he and Denck became warm friends and found certain common areas in their disagreement with Luther.

The next meeting between Hut and Denck was in Augsburg in May 1526. Denck spent some time in Mühlhausen after his expulsion from Nürnberg, but apparently did not meet Hut, who at that time was active with Müntzer at Mühlhausen and Frankenhausen. By June 1525 Denck was already in St. Gall, where he contacted some of the Swiss Anabaptists. From the fall of 1525 to November 1526 Denck was occupied as a teacher in Augsburg. Toward the end of April 1526 Balthasar Hubmaier passed through Augsburg on his way to Moravia. After convincing Denck of the importance of believers' baptism, he baptized him.[68] Hubmaier and Denck had probably met in Regensburg in the fall of 1522, and it is possible that Hubmaier won him for the cause of the Reformation at that time.[69] In this way Denck became the first Anabaptist of southeastern Germany.

64 Kiwiet, *Denck*, p. 237. Cf. Friedrich Roth, *Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte* (München, 1881), pp. 185-188.
65 Fellmann, 6, 20 f.
66 Kiwiet, *Denck*, p. 239.
67 Fellmann, pp. 20-26.
68 Kiwiet, *Denck*, p. 245.
69 *Ibid.*, p. 233.

After visiting Denck in the fall of 1524, Hut had come under the influence of Müntzer, and in the spring of 1525 was present at the battle of Frankenhausen. Immediately after the battle he took up the cause of revolution in his home town of Bibra. There is no trace of Hut in the known sources from this time until he turned up in Augsburg toward the end of May 1526 for a stay of three to four days. While there he stayed at Denck's home near the Holy Cross Gate. After a series of discussions Denck baptized Hut on May 26, 1526 (the only baptism ever performed by Denck). This was Hut's first encounter with anyone who had been rebaptized, and he said that he had had no prior intention of receiving baptism. Denck's own experience and the testimony of a visitor, Caspar Färber, about the godly lives of those who had been rebaptized finally convinced him.[70] The change to a noticeably more moderate tone in Hut between his sermon at Bibra in May 1525 and the one in Königsberg[71] in the fall of 1526 is without doubt due to his baptism and identification with the Anabaptist movement. A few days after his baptism Hut left on a journey, now as an Anabaptist missionary, baptizing and founding congregations wherever he went. After working in Franconia and Thuringia he returned to Augsburg in February 1527, but he did not meet Denck again until August 1527, after he had visited Moravia and traveled through Austria.

Walter Fellmann holds that Denck wrote only one tract before he was baptized.[72] Hut does not refer to any of Denck's tracts, but it is possible that Denck had written another one or two and that Hut was able to see them at the time of his baptism. The only direct dependence of Hut on Denck is in the thirty-nine Scriptural contradictions which Denck published in this year[73] and which appear in Hut's tract on the Scriptures.[74] There seems to be no textual evidence to show which series was written first, but in all likelihood Hut borrowed from Denck. The fact that only eight of the contradictions appear in Landsperger's edition[75] of Hut's tract might be an indication that Denck's list was added later. The similarities in point of view between Denck and Hut are many and will be traced in the following section.

The last meeting between Hut and Denck took place at Augsburg in August 1527. Denck left Augsburg in November 1526 and spent two months in Strasbourg. From February to June 1527 he was in Worms, where he aided Haetzer in translating the Prophets and wrote his tract *Von der wahren Liebe*. In July he was in Basel

70 *Confessions*, p. 224.
71 *Ibid.*, p. 241.
72 Fellmann, pp. 27, 48.
73 *Ibid.*, pp. 68-73.
74 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, pp. 29-31.

and in August he passed through Zürich, arriving in Augsburg in time for the Martyr Synod.

Hut had been active from May 1526 to August 1527 as an Anabaptist apostle in Franconia, Moravia, and Austria. The Martyr Synod was a fitting climax and culmination of his work as an Anabaptist leader; he spent the rest of his days in prison until his death in December 1527. Many of the men who gathered at the synod were won to the Anabaptist cause by Hut, and his vision of the apostolate was responsible for the fact that men were commissioned and sent out to spread Anabaptist teachings in all the adjoining areas.

Hut reports that the synod was made up of two or three major meetings. The purpose of the gathering was to review the field of work, and to commission Anabaptist apostles. It is now recognized that Hut was the dominant figure at the synod and that the one extant letter[76] from his hand was probably written at this time. The letter was to be sent along with the commissioned apostles, and is a striking example of Hut's concern for the unity of the Church. The men who wrote and worked after the synod are the best testimony to the final effect of Hut's life and thought on the South German Anabaptist movement. The concern of this section is to trace the relationship between the co-founders of the South German Anabaptist movement.

In personality, Hut and Denck differed radically. Denck struggled with the religious problem in its philosophical and theological aspects; Hut was an activist and dealt with it in practical and radical terms. Denck's final position was a logical development from the foundation of his first confession; Hut shifted radically from one extreme to the other. Denck baptized only one man and did not found any Anabaptist congregations; Hut baptized hundreds of men and founded new congregations wherever he went. Toward the end of his life Denck became somewhat disillusioned with his relationship to the Anabaptist movement,[77] while Hut threw his whole weight into the spread of the movement and gave his life for the faith of the brotherhood. These differences should be kept in mind as writings of the two men are compared and contrasted.

Although both Hut and Denck came to the Anabaptist movement by different routes and served it in different ways, both received believers' baptism and served as joint founders of the movement in

75 *Mittheilungen aus dem Antiquariate von S. Calvary and Co.* I (Berlin, 1869), pp. 156-166.

76 Printed in *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, p. 12; also Cornelius, *op. cit.*, pp. 251 f.

77 The reasons that Kiwiet gives (*Denck*, pp. 257-259) for challenging one paragraph in the recantation are not very satisfying. There are other places in which Denck makes similar allusions (Fellmann, *op. cit.*, p. 105). These statements do not negate his positive contribution to the South German Anabaptist movement.

South Germany. Different as they were, they worked together successfully. In his confession of September 16, 1527, Hut says that they taught together, the subject of their teaching being "the crucified Christ, the Lord's Supper, and that men should be converted in these last days.[78] It is quite possible that Denck was influential in changing Hut's convictions about eschatology. Their co-operation proves that the dedication to the spread of the Kingdom of God on earth can outweigh differences in personality and teaching.

The similarities between the views of Hut and Denck are many. Concerning the covenant, baptism, the Lord's Supper, discipleship, suffering, and discipline there seem to be parallels. It is quite difficult, however, to trace much direct dependence. Since many of the shared basic concepts were included in Denck's first confession, written long before Hut became an Anabaptist, it is probable that more concepts and ideas flowed from Denck to Hut than vice versa. This does not deny their mutual effect upon one another.

Even as there was some common ground between Hut and Müntzer, there is some among all three men. The emphasis on suffering, conversion, the fear of God, and radical faith are in some sense common to all three. But when Hut and Denck related these concepts to the gathered church rather than to direct revelations, visions, dreams, and a revolutionary eschatology, an unbridgeable gulf was fixed.[79] It is not very likely that Hut and Denck would have co-operated as well with Thomas Müntzer, had he been at the Martyr Synod, as they did with one another.

B. Eschatology

Although Denck has usually been thought of as having nothing to say about eschatology, there are some statements and biblical references that indicate it was not completely foreign to his theology. He, for instance, spoke of the end of the world,[80] the great Judgment,[81] and echoed Hut in saying that God was stronger than His enemies[82] and would put them to shame and annihilate them.[83] His position, however, culminated in a patient waiting rather than any kind of revolutionary activity. After stating his hope to be separated from the unrighteous, he said that "it is with this conscience that I await with joy and without fear the decision of Jesus Christ."[84] Al-

78 *Confessions*, p. 227.

79 If a contemporary illustration (not parallel) were permitted, the quoting that a socialist might do from the writings of Marx could serve the purpose. There certainly are some parallels between the two but to say that this relates or equates them in any significant way is to overlook the basic differences.

80 *Ibid.*, p. 26.

81 *Ibid.*

82 *Ibid.*, p. 100.

83 *Ibid.*

84 *Ibid.*, p. 108.

though Denck quoted from Matthew 24,[85] it does not necessarily follow that Hut was influenced by him in the matter of eschatology.

The relationship between eschatology and ethics is very close. Luther[86] believed that the Roman Church with its Pope was the Antichrist and that the end of the world was not far off; because the true church was invisible it was necessary to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments to the whole territorial community. Out of this eschatology grew his theory of the two kingdoms: the realm of God and the neighbor and the realm of the state and society. A Christian man must live in both, even if he has to accept the Sermon on the Mount in the one and reject it in the other.

Müntzer[87] believed that the church and worldly society were incompatible. The latter, particularly through its authorities, was frustrating the work of God; consequently all those possessed of the living Spirit must unite to annihilate the ungodly, that God might be able to set up His Kingdom on earth and rule over His people. This eschatology justified the use of the sword and was dependent on violence and the overthrow of established authority.

Denck believed that the Kingdom of God was represented on earth in the Anabaptist movement and that the church must be holy and separate as it lives in the world and witnesses. Christ was already Lord of all, but this would be fully realized when He returned and the fulfillment was accomplished. This eschatology implied that the Christian must keep the distinction between church and world clear by following Christ in the path of nonresistant, suffering love. This way is initiated by the Word of God, must be responded to by men in the covenant of baptism, and is sustained in the disciplined fellowship of believers.

Hut[88] believed at one point in his life that Müntzer's radical revolutionary position was right; but when he identified himself with the Anabaptist movement he believed that the Kingdom of God was represented on earth by that movement and that it did not have to be ushered in by force. Hut was still convinced that Christ would return shortly, but the date of His return was unknown and His Kingdom would be spiritual. This implied a radical subjection of every area of life to the church-brotherhood and a willingness to go the way of suffering, for the church in the world is under the sign of the cross.

85 *Ibid.*, p. 100.
86 See George W. Forell, *Faith Active in Love; An Investigation of the Principles Underlying Luther's Social Ethics* (New York, 1954). Cf. a review by William Klassen, *MQR* XXIX (1955), pp. 244-247.
87 See above, III, C.
88 See above, II, B.

Hut was not always clear what the consequences would be when he called for a voluntary church separated from the world, but he was willing to take the risk. What it involved can be seen more clearly in the lives and writings of his disciples and associates in the South German Anabaptist movement.

V. The Influence of Hans Hut on the South German Anabaptist Movement

In his tract *Ein christlicher Underricht* Hut says that there are three ways to come to a knowledge of God: first through the might and power (*almechtigkait und kraft*) of God expressed in created things; secondly, through the severity and righteousness (*ernst und gerechtigbait*) of Jesus Christ; and thirdly, through the goodness and mercy (*güete und barmherzigkait*) of the Holy Spirit.[89] Regarding the first, he said that it was through created things that man became a slave to this world. Creation tempts and entices man away from his true purpose, which is fellowship with God. Concerning the second, it was through the severity and righteousness of Christ that the bonds of servitude to created things are broken. Christ is the only way out of the kingdom of this world and the only means into the kingdom of God. Concerning the third, the church is the realm where the Holy Spirit is active and represents the goal for the Christian indicovenant brotherhood where the Holy Spirit is active in works of vidual and the realization of God's purpose for man. This is the love, justice, sharing, and brotherly discipline.[90] Hut related these three categories to the three parts of the Apostolic Creed: the Father,[91] the Son,[92] and the Holy Spirit.[93]

Much of Hut's thought and that of his followers in the South German Anabaptist movement fits into this threefold scheme. Leonhard Schiemer's tract *Von dreierlei Gnad*[94] follows this pattern, and his commentary on the Apostles' Creed is probably one of the finest examples of this interpretation among Anabaptist writings.[95] Peter Riedemann's *Confession of Faith* written at Gmunden between 1529 and 1532 is also organized around these three central assertions.[96] Beyond these, there are many more parallels. For example, Jesus' command to His disciples, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation; he who believes and is baptized will be saved,"[97] was understood by Hut and his followers to tie in with the threefold scheme. The Word was to be preached to those enslaved

89 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, p. 28.
90 *Ibid.*, 29.
91 *Ibid.*, 32.
92 *Ibid.*, 33.
93 *Ibid.*, 35.
94 *Ibid.*, 58-71; cf. *Kunstbuch*, 99-121.
95 *Ibid.*, 44-58; cf. *Kunstbuch*, 122-137.
96 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, Number 8 (MSS).
97 Mark 16:16 (RSV).

by created things. If they believed the preaching, came to faith in God, and committed themselves to the way of the cross and suffering, they were ready to be baptized into the church, the covenant community of the Holy Spirit. This progression through preaching and believing, to baptism, appeared often in South German Anabaptist tracts and confessions.[98]

In Hut's tract the created things represented the world, and the realm of the Holy Spirit represented the church. The crucial area, however, was that which lay between, because Hut and most other Anabaptists felt that this was the area neglected by the Reformers, and because it represented the only possible means to move from the world into the church.[99]

The central area, concerning the severity and righteousness of Christ, involved Hut's teaching about suffering discipleship and the work of Christ. The logical step from here is to a study of the church, the realm of the Holy Spirit. This includes primarily a discussion of baptism and the covenant, with a brief look at economic sharing. Finally comes the first division, the world. This will be looked at in the light of the church's relation to the world and more specifically to the state. This will lead to a study of eschatology and the Anabaptist view of God's hand in history.

Though there is a progression for the individual from (1) attachment to the world, through (2) identification with Christ, to (3) the church-brotherhood, it is also important to realize in using the threefold scheme that there is a real sense in which the church and the Christian live in all three at the same time and all the time. For this reason the people of God stand under the cross and must suffer. The Christian lives in the world while he is living in the church and it is because of this that he must go the way of suffering and misunderstanding. Christ alone could reconcile church and world, and when He did so it meant suffering, the cross, and death. Christ's following this way as the God-man not only provides for man's redemption and salvation but constitutes a call to each Christian to go the same way. As soon as a man is willing to go this way he finds that he is not alone—there is a community under the cross. This is the church.

A. The Church

1. *Suffering Discipleship*

Spurious Faith. In his writing *Von geheimnus der tauff* Hut criticized those who taught nothing other than "faith, faith,"[100] but

98 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 15.
99 *Ibid.*, 36.
100 *Ibid.*, 13; cf. *Kunstbuch*, 42-43.

did not indicate the means by which one comes to it. The whole tract is centered around the idea that preaching must come first, then faith, and after both, baptism. In the closing paragraph of his other tract, *Ein christlicher underricht,* Hut said again that some talked about the goal and purpose of God for His people but they did not reveal how one progresses toward that goal. They received men as if they had attained salvation through the suffering Christ, not realizing that these men desired nothing but an easy faith. This always produces an impudent, lazy people, with no reformation of life.[101]

In his commentary on the Apostles' Creed, Schiemer said that men in his day spoke a great deal about faith, but when they were asked just what it was and how one came to possess it, they had no answer.[102] They heard songs about faith and heard it spoken about, but had come to believe that the physical hearing of the word was sufficient. This kind of person refused to stand by Christ when He was before Pilate and to suffer with Him when He was on the cross.[103] Christ has suffered for mankind but not so that men would not have to suffer. An easy faith that tries to avoid suffering will last only until it is persecuted.[104] Schlaffer said the carnal preachers were saying that Christ had done everything; all that men could do was to believe.[105]

The criticism of *sola fide* theology is common among South German Anabaptists. In contrast to an easy faith that does not accept the consequences and implications in life, Hut and the South German Anabaptists emphasized the idea of the imitation of Christ and the New Testament teaching that discipleship brings with it suffering, affliction, the cross, and persecution.

Imitation of Christ. Concerning the imitation of Christ, Hut stated very unequivocally, "No one is able to arrive at the truth unless he follows in the steps of Christ and His chosen ones in the school of affliction."[106] An image common to Hut and his followers was the Christian suffering with Christ in His life, death, and resurrection.

Ambrosius Spittelmayr said that members of the body of Christ must live, suffer, and die as the Head died for them.[107] This does not minimize the significance of the atonement of Christ. "Christ, true God and man, the head of all His members, has erased with His suffering the eternal wrath of God against us. He has reconciled us

101 *Ibid.,* 37.
102 *Ibid.,* 48.
103 *Ibid.,* 53.
104 *Ibid.,* 73.
105 *Ibid.,* 95.
106 *Ibid.,* 14.
107 *Bayern* I, 51. See Herbert C. Klassen, "Ambrosius Spittelmayr: His Life and Teachings," *MQR* XXXII (July 1958).

and restored us to peace with God, and His suffering and death have opened for us the Kingdom from which we had fallen because of Adam."[108] Spittelmayr argued that men must not only believe this, but must also be willing to go the same way. He also made use of the image of Christ as the Word that is spiritually conceived, born, circumcised, baptized, and preached in His disciples.[109] Schiemer[110] and Schlaffer[111] use this concept in a similar manner. In his 1531 Confession, Marpeck referred to sins and lusts being nailed to the cross with Christ and being buried in His death.[112] The anonymous tract *Von der Genugthuung Christi* has a similar point of view.[113] Riedemann said that Christ lived His life as an example that men might follow in His steps.[114]

The imitation of Christ was also carried over to Christ's descent into hell. Hut said that the Christian must descend into hell and be led out in his struggle from unbelief to faith.[115] In his discussion of the Apostles' Creed, Schiemer related to the life of the Christian all eleven sections concerning Christ. In the section on Christ's descent into hell he referred to the experience of Jonah and Job and to Christ's cry of despair from the cross. When a Christian has experienced this descent into hell and realized that he had been forsaken by God for a moment, he came to know what it means to love God for His own sake.[116] Schiemer compared despair and suffering with Christ to wine in a wound, and the comfort and mercy of the Holy Spirit to oil.[117] Schlaffer said that every man who wanted to experience salvation in Christ must also experience the depths of Christ in the cross, in desertion, and in hell. "For whoever is not condemned by the world and cast into hell with Christ will be cast into hell later with the damned. Whoever descends into hell with Christ, i.e., in Christ, will be led out again by God, for He will not allow His members to remain in hell."[118] Marpeck believed that water was a sign of the new birth in the Scriptures and referred to affliction, dread, need, and suffering. This was the sign of Jonah. All flesh must receive the death sentence and pass through the gates of hell before it can enter the narrow path that leads to life.[119] Denck related Christ's descent into hell to despair and suffering in the Christian life.[120]

The Cross. Related to the Christian's identification with Christ

108 *Ibid.*
109 *Bayern* I, 52-53.
110 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 53, 66.
111 *Ibid.*, 89, 95.
112 J. C. Wenger, ed., "Pilgram Marpeck's Confession of Faith Composed at Strassburg, December 1531–January 1532," *MQR* XXII (1938), 189-200. Hereafter, Marpeck, *Confession.*
113 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, Number I, p. 6 (MSS).
114 *Ibid.*, number 8, p. 20 (MSS).
115 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 21, 23.
116 *Ibid.*, 52.
117 *Ibid.*, 70-71.
118 *Ibid.*, 96.
119 Marpeck, *Confession*, 190.
120 Fellmann, 23, 92, 93, 95.

is his acceptance of the cross. The cross played an important role in the life and thought of the Anabaptists of South Germany. The challenge of Jesus to His disciples to deny themselves, take up their cross, and follow Him is echoed in most South German Anabaptist tracts and confessions. Schiemer saw the cross as the test that revealed whether faith was genuine or not.[121] The Spirit of Christ will not enter a man unless he submits under the cross and discipline of God. "Without the cross it is impossible for God to save me, despite His power."[122] Men who ask for righteousness are praying for the cross, and if they submit to it they will enter the fellowship of the saints.[123] Marpeck referred to the mystery of the cross in the context of affliction, fear, distress, and suffering.[124]

Suffering. When the consequences of discipleship and the imitation of Christ were made more explicit there was a strong emphasis on suffering, affliction, and persecution. This has been illustrated in the writings of Hut, where even the righteousness of Christ expressed itself through suffering, affliction, and persecution.[125] Schiemer said that the calling of the Christian means a call to suffer. Men who believe in Christ must suffer because of Him.[126] A statement of Peter's was very popular among the Anabaptists: "Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought, for whoever has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin."[127]

Schlaffer said in his tract, *Ein einfaltiger Unterricht zum Anfang eines gotseliges Lebens (A Short Instruction at the Beginning of a True Christian Life),* that the whole Bible speaks about the suffering of the elect from Abel down to the apostles.[128] In this same context the Revelation of St. John refers to Christ as the lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world.[129] Baptism of fire is the fervent love to God and the neighbor that makes a man willing to suffer all things.[130]

In relationship to the discussion of the Lord's Supper and the eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, the theme of suffering was frequently introduced. [131] Schiemer used the image of

121 Schiemer, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, p. 51, Schlaffer, *ibid.*, 90, 113; *Von der Genugthuung Christi, Glaubenszeugnisse* II, Nos. 1, 4, 11 (MSS).
122 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 66.
123 *Ibid.*, 73.
124 Marpeck, *Confession,* 190.
125 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 29.
126 *Ibid.*, 51.
127 I Peter 4:1. Schiemer, *ibid.*, 66, 72; Schaffer, *ibid.*, 89, 115; Riedemann, *ibid.*, II, 113 (MSS).
128 *Ibid.*, I, 88.
129 Hut, *ibid.*, 22; Schlaffer, *ibid.*, 88, 109; *Kunstbuch,* 153; Fellmann, 95.
130 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 92.
131 Hut, *Bayern* I, 44; Spittelmayr, *ibid.*, 49, 53-53; Schiemer, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 54; Schlaffer, *Kunstbuch,* 109, 155; Marpeck, *Confession,* 196; Riedemann, *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, Nos. 8, 95, 99, 104, 105 (MSS).

the crushed grapes: "A draught from this flask is nothing other than a beaten, pulverized, crushed, and grieving heart, beaten with the mortar of the cross, for the grapes in God's vineyard must all submit to the winepress and be trodden by affliction, if wine is to result."[132] Riedemann also used this parable, as well as that of the ground grains of wheat.[133] The Supper was conducted by the Anabaptists not only in memory of the sufferings of Christ but as a reminder to the church of the suffering it must endure.

The theme of suffering also played an important role in Marpeck's Confession. Members of the church are considered to be companions in suffering for they have been baptized into the afflictions of Christ.[134] No man will enter the Kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit, i.e., of affliction and comfort, of Christ and the Holy Spirit.[135] Marpeck interpreted water as a symbol of suffering and distress.

After stating with Paul that the Christian makes up in his body the sufferings that began in Christ, Riedemann emphasized the fact that this does not identify suffering and salvation.[136] Life in the branch is a result of its attachment to the vine, and where this union exists fruit is to be expected. Members of the body of Christ who share the joys of salvation must also share Christ's suffering.

Beginning with Hut, a patterned use was made of John's list of three witnesses to the Christian life, the Spirit, the water, and the blood.[137] The Spirit is related to the covenant that God makes with man when man commits himself to live by His Word. Water was always related to the outward sign of baptism whereby a believer was acknowledged to be a living member of the body of Christ on earth. The blood was related to suffering and persecution, both as individual disciples and as a church. Indeed, all main-line Anabaptists thought of suffering as not only an individual experience that led to true faith-membership in the body of Christ, but also as a corporate reality that characterized the continuing life of the church. If one member suffered the whole body suffered, for the whole brotherhood was under the cross.

Creaturen. One of the characteristic aspects of Hut's teaching that relates to his understanding of Scripture and the nature of the Christian proclamation and experience was his concept of created things (*Creaturen*). These created things play a twofold role; nega-

132 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 72.
133 *Ibid,,* II, number 8, pp. 104-105 (MSS).
134 Marpeck, *Confession,* 170, 173.
135 *Ibid.,* 189.
136 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, 102-103, (MSS).
137 I John 5:8. See Hut, *Bayern* I, 43; Spittelmayr, *ibid.,* 53, 55; Schiemer, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 52, 73, 77, 79; Schlaffer, *ibid.,* 93, 114; Marpeck, *Confession,* 170, 190, 194, 195.

tively, they tempt man to live as if the things that are seen are the most important part of life; positively, man can experience the might and power of God through them. Created things can serve as allegories or parables of what God is trying to teach and achieve in His children.[138] Reference has already been made to the parable of the tree[139] that must have its branches cut off before it can be used in the construction of a house, and to animals that must suffer and die before they can be consumed by man.[140] In both instances they illustrate the necessity of suffering in the Christian life.

Righteousness. Lastly it will be helpful to look at the relationship of suffering discipleship to righteousness and justification before God. It has already been indicated that suffering and the imitation of Christ are not set forth by the authors under study as a substitute for the righteousness that comes by faith. This righeousness, however, is never thought of as a mere change of attitude in the heart of God, in legal or forensic terms. Hut believed that when God declared a man righteous He also made him righteous. "In order to be used of God, God must justify us and cleanse us inside and outside, internally from inordinate desires and lusts and externally from wrong paths and misuse the created things."[141] To be declared righteous (*gerechtfertigt*) and to be made righteous (*gerechtmachung*) go hand in hand in the thought of the South German Anabaptists. "The righteousness that is acceptable with God does not derive from an untried faith. But the whole world fears righteousness like the devil, and would gladly pay for it with a spurious faith, but this will not achieve righteousness. This righteousness is not taught or proclaimed by its preachers, for they themselves are enemies of the cross of Christ and of righteousness."[142] The central assertion of Hut's tracts is that man experiences the righteousness of God through identification with Christ by faith.[143] This is basic to the Anabaptist position in South Germany.

The experience of the righteousness of God does not make men perfect or sinless, but as long as they are hungering and thirsting after righteousness God does not forsake them when they sin.[144] The Anabaptists were convinced that reformation of the life of the disciples was a vital part of the reformation of the church.

138 Hut, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 17-19; Spittelmayr, *Bayern* I, 48; Schiemer, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 49, 62; Schlaffer, *ibid.*, 85-88, 94-95, 112; Riedemann, *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, number 8, p. 63 (MSS).

139 Hut, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 18, 33; Schiemer, *ibid.*, 67; Schlaffer, *ibid.*, 86; Riedemann, *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, number 8, p. 52 (MSS).

140 See Mecenseffy, *op. cit.*, 255-257. She points out the similarity between Hut, Schlaffer, and an Anabaptist from Freistadt on this subject.

141 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 18.

142 *Ibid.*, 23; cf. *Kunstbuch*, 52.

143 See above, Section B: The Church.

144 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 36.

One of the most comprehensive discussions of righteousness by an Anabaptist author is contained in Schiemer's tract *Von dreierlei Gnad.*[145] In a masterly way he relates righteousness to imitation of Christ, suffering, self-denial, the cross, sharing, admonition, and church discipline. Somewhat similar discussions are found in Schlaffer[146] and Riedemann.[147] The latter is the only one in the early South German area who used the term "Gerechtmachung." Faith not only justifies men before God but makes them pious (*fromm*) and righteous. Riedemann taught that those who follow in Christ's footsteps and go the way of discipleship and suffering will find that Christ's yoke is easy and His burden light.[148]

2. *Baptism and Covenant* (Holy Spirit).

After the severity and righteousness of Christ have been experienced, the goodness and mercy of the Holy Spirit provide consolation and comfort for the disciple in the church. Although suffering discipleship and related concepts played a crucial role in the thought of the Anabaptists, it was in the area of the nature of the church that they made their major contribution and ran into conflict with the Reformers.

It has already been pointed out that Hut's identification with the Anabaptist church was a crucial point in his experiences and consequently a central fact in his thought. "When there are a number of Christians who have gone the way of the cross, suffering, and sorrow, and are covenanted together, they become one congregation and one body in Christ—a visible church."[149] Since most of the men whose writings are under study in this chapter were either baptized by Hut or by one of his followers, it is understandable that they shared his view of the church. By breaking down the general view of the nature of the church into the role of the covenant, believers' baptism, discipline, economic sharing, and the Lord's Supper, it will be possible to trace the influence of Hut on the South German Anabaptist movement more carefully.

Covenant. Hut's concept of the covenant was larger than his concept of baptism. The covenant was the commitment to live by the Word of God, under obedience to Christ, suffering whatever God ordained for His disciples.[150] It was also considered a commitment before a Christian congregation that had the right to bind and to loose.[151] When this was true it became a covenant of rebirth and renewal in the Holy Spirit.[152] Spittelmayr substantiated this view when

145 *Ibid.*, 65-70.
146 *Ibid.*, 95.
147 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, 31.
148 *Ibid.*, number 8, pp. 31-32 (MSS).
149 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 36.
150 *Ibid.*, 20.
151 *Ibid.*
152 *Ibid.*, 21.

he said, "God makes His covenant with His own when He receives them as children. This covenant is realized in the Spirit, in baptism, and in the drinking of the cup—which Christ has called the drinking of blood."[153]

Schlaffer said that a man who accepts the Gospel, receives repentance and forgiveness of sins, and gives himself totally in faith to God, has entered the covenant that God makes with man and man makes with God.[154] Marpeck sharpened this definition of covenant by introducing the distinction between sign and testimony.[155] Circumcision was a covenant sign that God made with all men. Because it was not a testimony on the part of man it could include infants. The new covenant is the testimony of a man's good conscience with God and therefore implies faith. Only those should be baptized who have made a covenant with God in faith as the testimony to a good conscience. It was Marpeck's contribution to insist that the form of the covenant and its essence, outward baptism and inner baptism, the visible church and the invisible church, cannot be separated.[156] If Hut had been forced to face the opposition and criticism of Spiritualists it is possible that he would have developed the logic of the Anabaptist position in the same direction.

In his Confession of 1529-1532 Riedemann referred to the covenant in baptism as the testimony of a good conscience with God.[157] In accepting the covenant, an individual recognized that he had a gracious Father who had forgiven his sins and had received him into the congregation of the saints. It was on this basis that man bound himself to keep God's statutes and walk in His ways. This was what the covenant of baptism meant—something impossible for a child that could not yet distinguish between good and evil.

The Anabaptist insistence on imitation of Christ and suffering was not foreign to medieval Christianity and would not have been offensive to either Roman or Reformation churches had it not been related to voluntary church membership through believers' baptism. This was a direct challenge to a social and religious tradition of a thousand years and could not be tolerated.[158]

Baptism. The stage was set for the introduction of believers' baptism in South Germany by the multitude of grievances against the Roman Church and the churches of the Reformers. The grievances in the thought of Hans Hut, Thomas Müntzer, and Hans

153 *Bayern* I, 49.
154 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 90.
155 Marpeck, *Confession*, 170, 192.
156 This has been clearly demonstrated by Bergsten, 35 f.
157 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, number 8, p. 39 (MSS).
158 See Albert H. Newman, *A History of Antipedobaptism* (Philadelphia, 1897). This work is somewhat dated but it is still very useful.

Denck have been briefly traced earlier in this article. To these grievances was added the deepening insight that though baptism was biblical and necessary, infant baptism was not. The gathering storm finally broke in South Germany when Balthasar Hubmaier,[159] coming from Switzerland, proclaimed the message that baptism should be by confession of faith and church membership by voluntary choice. The view of baptism need not be traced here since it was common to the whole South German movement beginning with Denck and Hut.

Discipline. Baptism and covenant were closely related in South German Anabaptist thought to induction into the church-brotherhood. After stating that the covenant in baptism involved a willingness to live in obedience to God and all Christians, Hut said that those who transgressed and sinned against God and brotherly love should be disciplined.[160] In one instance Hut described this practice with the word "ban."[161] Spittelmayr followed Hut in his description of brotherly admonition and discipline.[162] Within the church-brotherhood members should be subject to one another in humble obedience.

In his discussion of "forgiveness of sins" in the Apostles' Creed, Schiemer quoted Christ's words from Matthew 18: "If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault, between you and him alone. But if he does not listen, take one or two others with you. . . . If he refuses to listen to them, tell it to the church, and if he refuses to listen even to the church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector. Truly, I say to you whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven."[163] He also quoted the incident from the Gospel of John in which Christ came to the disciples through locked doors and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained."[164] One of the important responsibilities of being covenanted to a Christian congregation was brotherly discipline. It was understood that whatever was bound or loosed by the covenant community was bound or loosed in heaven.[165] The importance of admonition and discipline is very obvious in the tract, *Discipline of Believers,* used at Rattenberg and attributed to Schiemer.[166]

159 See Johann Loserth, "Balthasar Hubmaier," *ME* II, Harold S. Bender, ed. (1956), 826-834.
160 *Bayern* I, 43.
161 *Ibid.*
162 *Ibid.,* 48.
163 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 57 (Matthew 18:15-18).
164 John 20:22-23 (RSV).
165 *Ibid.,* 68.
166 Robert Friedman, ed., "The Oldest Church Discipline of the Anabaptists," *MQR* XXIX (1955), 164. Hereafter, *Discipline of Believers.*

Schlaffer said that water baptism served as a sign whereby Christians could recognize one another, show brotherly love to one another, and help each other with teaching, admonition, discipline, excommunication, binding, and loosing.[167] After having described the steps that led to membership in the Kingdom of God, Marpeck said that children of God have the right to bind and loose. This he called the ban and said that it was controlled by the Holy Spirit. Those who live in direct opposition to love should be excluded from the Lord's Supper, which he described as a love feast.[168] The Anabaptist feeling concerning the nature of the church was expressed very warmly in one of Marpeck's prayers, "That we might live together in faithfulness and truth, teaching, warning, admonishing, and disciplining one another so that we might be able to hear, understand, and live in obedience to the Word of faith. To this end I have committed myself to God, to all true believers, and to all men, with all that I am and have, in order to give myself in service through Jesus Christ."[169]

Love Sharing. Common to all the Anabaptists of South German, beginning with Hut, was the conviction that voluntary sharing of goods should be a part of the life of the covenant community. In describing the Christian congregation Hut said, "There all goodness, mercy, praise, glory, and honor appear in the Holy Spirit, there all things are common, nothing private."[170] Hut also characterized the covenant commitment to Christ and all brothers and sisters as involving body, life, property, and honor regardless of what the world might say.[171]

One of the finest expressions of this ideal of voluntary love-sharing is found in a written confession of Ambrosius Spittelmayr:

> Nobody can inherit the Kingdom unless he is poor with Christ, for a Christian has nothing of his own, no place where he can lay his head. A real Christian should not even have enough property on earth to be able to stand on it with one foot. This does not mean that he should go and lie down in the woods and not have a trade, or that he should not have fields and meadows or that he should not work, but alone that he might not think they are for his own use and he tempted to say: this house is mine, this field is mine, this dollar is mine. Rather he should say it is ours, even as we pray: Our Father. In summary, a Christian should not have anything of his own but should have all things in common with his brother, i.e., not allow him to suffer need. In other words, I will not work that my house be filled, that my larder be supplied with meat, but rather I will see that my brother has enough, for a Christian looks more to

167 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 93.
168 Marpeck, *Confession*, 170-171.
169 *Ibid.*, 197.
170 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 36.
171 *Ibid.*, 20.

> his neighbor than to himself. Whoever desires to be rich in this world, who is concerned that he miss nothing when it comes to his person and property, who is honored by men and feared by them, who refuses to prostrate himself at the feet of his Lord . . . will be humbled.[172]

There is an element of paradox in Spittelmayr's attitude to property that is also seen in Paul's social ethic, "Let . . . those who buy [live] as though they had no goods, and those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it."[173] Spittelmayr was convinced in theory that if all men became Christians at once, and if they were at unity in faith and Spirit, they would hold all goods equally and in common.

When the authorities tried to apply in their logical thought what Hut and Spittelmayr said about the church to society at large they became alarmed. If nobody should possess anything, who would till the soil and work? Men would become irresponsible and there would be nobody to maintain peace and order. As soon as something was accumulated it would have to be given away to some lazy drunkard who refused to work. Spittelmayr explained that he was thinking only of the church and in the church there should be no lazy drunkards. True Christians would not be idle, nor would they rely on their brothers for sustenance. If all men were Christians they would still work to capacity and earn their bread by the sweat of their brows. Any fears in the hearts of the authorities about law and order should have been assuaged by Spittelmayr's confession, "If there should be one hundred [Anabaptists] in this or any other town and there were only ten not of their faith, they would not molest them nor take away their land and property. All they would do is pray to God for them that they might also be enlightened by the divine Word."[174]

This view of sharing within the brotherhood is well represented in Schiemer's tracts[175] and in the *Discipline of Believers*.[176] In Schlaffer,[177] Marpeck,[178] and Riedemann,[179] sharing is alluded to in the context of the lordship of Christ over every area of a covenant brother's life. Brandhuber's letter to the church at Rattenberg works out the implications of the free sharing of goods[180] in greater detail than any other pre-Hutterite statement.

172 *Bayern* I, 49.
173 I Cor. 7:30-31 (RSV).
174 *Ibid.*, 37.
175 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 49, 56, 58, 60, 67.
176 *Discipline of Believers*, 164.
177 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 109.
178 Marpeck, *Confession*, 197.
179 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, Number 8, p. 21 (MSS).
180 *Ibid.*, I, 137.

The Lord's Supper. All the Anabaptists of South Germany agreed in rejecting the Roman interpretation of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. Hut stated this very briefly in one of his confessions.[181] Spittelmayr went somewhat further and decried the wooden interpretation of the Scriptures that supported the view of the Roman priests. He showed that eating the flesh of Christ meant the imitation of the life of Christ, and drinking the blood of Christ meant the willingness to suffer all that God ordained.[182] The actual participation in the Supper was advocated by Schiemer, Schlaffer, and the other leaders in South Germany as a memorial to the death of Christ.[183] The first comprehensive treatment of the Lord's Supper by a South German Anabaptist appeared in Riedemann's Confession written at Gmunden.[184]

Very little is said about church order in the tracts of the South German Anabaptists. The *Discipline of Believers* adopted at Rattenberg affords a clearer insight into church order than all the other writings combined. Hut's dynamic view of the missionary task of the church and of the apostolate characterized the South German Anabaptist movement until it was persecuted into quiescence in the mid-sixteenth century.

B. The State

The last section of Hut's threefold scheme is concerned about God and what He is doing in the world, in the state, and in history. If this is God's world, if the state is ordained by God, and if God is going to bring history to an end, what is the relationship of God's people, the church, to these other realms in which God is active?

1. *God's World and the Church*

The Anabaptists of South Germany had no clearly defined doctrine of the world. They made no effort to relate their view of God, man, and the world, to culture and civilization. Their one consuming interest was the church, and in their eyes everything that was not church was world. The principles of voluntary membership, charismatic leadership, economic sharing, and the subjection of every area of life to the task of spreading the Kingdom of God naturally brought them into sharp conflict with the economic system and the social and religious norms of the sixteenth century.

Hut's concept of the covenant brotherhood implies a radical distinction between the Kingdom of this world and the Kingdom of God. In the eyes of Spittelmayr as well, the borders of society and

181 *Bayern* I, 43-44.
182 *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53
183 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 54.
184 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, number 8, 99-105 (MSS).

the borders of the church were not co-terminous. In the covenant-brotherhood there was to be love, justice, sharing, and brotherly admonition. These things have never been characteristic of the world.

Schiemer said that there was more to the Christian life than just a submission to God under the cross of Christ. A Christian must be ready to separate himself from all those who will not submit to Christ and on the other hand he must be willing to practice love and community with all those who do.[185] This separation was also intrinsic to Schlaffer's view of the nature of church and world.[186]

In Marpeck's confession there is a strong sense of the Lordship of Christ over all principalities, dominions, and powers; although Christ rules over the world, He is alone recognized as Head of His body, the church.[187] It was only the church that was submitting willingly to His kingship and rule. It was because of this difference that the world and its governments should play no role in the functioning of the church. A Christian's citizenship was in heaven first and then among men. Riedemann also called for separation of the people of God from the contamination of the world.[188]

Separation from the world was expressed in eschatological terms in the tract *Von der Genugthuung Christi.* The church must go out from Babylon and not believe its scribes, for they have based their salvation on works. Those under the discipline of Christ hear the voice of God calling them to be separate from the sin and uncleanness of Babylon.[189]

2. *God's State and the Church*

Separation of Church and State. The separation of church and state was a doctrine common to all South German Anabaptism. This meant primarily that the state should not be permitted to exert any influence or authority over faith and life in the church. Spittelmayr said that the authorities should not have any power to coerce the souls and consciences of men.[190] Marpeck pointed out very clearly that the state had its place as long as it did not interfere in the work of the church. The Holy Spirit was blasphemed when secular authorities were allowed to rule in the Kingdom of Christ.[191] The church was made up only of those who submitted willingly and obediently to the rule of Christ.

Obedience to the Authorities. The implications of the separation of church and state for the church were a problem that constantly faced the Anabaptists. Beginning with Hut there was agreement

185 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 67.
186 *Ibid.*, 122.
187 Marpeck, *Confession*, 198-199.
188 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, number 8, 116 (MSS).
189 *Ibid.*, number I, p. 14 (MSS)
190 *Bayern* I, 38-39.
191 Marpeck, *Confession*, 197.

among South German Anabaptists that in community, state, and civil matters there should be total obedience to the government.[192] Christ taught that one must give it the obedience that was its due. Schiemer stated the principle thus: "But Christians are obedient to the prince of this world in matters pertaining to body and property; but to the prince of heaven, our Lord Jesus Christ, they are obedient with souls and all things that pertain to the faith."[193] Schlaffer was sure that if the authorities knew of the healthy attitude of the Anabaptists they would desire that all their citizens were Christians.[194] Marpeck said, "Secular rulers are servants of God in temporal matters and not in the Kingdom of Christ. They deserve to receive all human honor, fear, obedience, taxation, and tribute, according to the words of Paul."[195] This willingness to be obedient is a clear testimony of the nonrevolutionary position of the South German Anabaptists.

Participation in Government. In acknowledging obedience to the authorities the Anabaptists recognized that government was ordained of God[196] and that it was responsible to protect the good and punish the evil. If civil authority was ordained of God, could a Christian participate in a government office? Hut was silent on this matter and Spittelmayr was not explicit. The latter said, "Those who are attached to the government because of human fear and submit in the area of the soul and conscience cannot be saved unless they do the command of Christ when He said: Forsake what you have and follow after me."[197] Schiemer, Schlaffer, Brandhuber, and Riedemann were also noncommital in this area. Marpeck said that if an office holder in the government was a Christian or became one, he was not permitte dto exercise his human power, authority, and rule in the Kingdom of Christ.[198] Marpeck was a civil engineer employed by the civil authorities in Strasbourg and Augsburg while he was serving the Anabaptist brotherhood. This position has more affinity to Denck's view, who said that a Christian in government should be gravitating out of his office,[199] than it does to the simple clarity with which the Schleitheim confession[200] prohibited participation in government. To be sure, serving as a civil engineer in government employ is quite different from serving as a magistrate.

Nonresistance to Evil. If the South German Anabaptists did not always give a clear answer regarding participation in governmental

192 *Confessions,* 227.
193 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 50.
194 *Ibid.,* 91.
195 Marpeck, *Confession, 197.*
196 Spittelmayr, *Bayern I,* 52; Schlaffer, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 97; Marpeck, *Confession,* 197.
197 *Bayern* I, 36.
198 Marpeck, *Confession,* 197.
199 Fellman, 84.
200 See J. C. Wenger, ed., "The Schleitheim Confession of Faith," *MQR* XIX (1945), 251.

offices, what did this imply regarding the use of the sword and nonresistance to evil? They obviously saw a distinction between the two for most of them were nonresistant, as has already been shown. According to Weischenfelder and Nadler, Hut taught nonparticipation in warfare and love for one's enemies.[201] Spittlemayr,[202] Schiemer,[203] and Schlaffer[204] followed Hut here. Riedemann made a strong plea in his confession for love of one's enemies and for returning good for evil.[205] Nothing is said in Marpeck's early confession, probably because this was not an issue between Bucer and himself at the time. In his later writings he stated a view consistent with the evangelical Anabaptist position.[206]

The Oath. In the matter of the oath Hut, Denck, and Jörg Probst Rothenfelder [207] shared a somewhat similar position. The views of Hut and Denck have already been examined. It could be said in general that South German Anabaptists did not apply the injunction of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount concerning the oath as literally and simply as did the Swiss Anabaptists[208] and the Dutch Mennonites.[209] The South German Anabaptists maintained that an oath could be sworn in community, state, and civil matters; only those things that opposed God should be avoided.

3. Eschatology and the Church.

In South German Anabaptist thought, eschatology in the Christian religion was not intrinsically an evil. Apart from the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Revelation there is in the teaching of Jesus and Paul a healthy emphasis on the hope of the Christian that Christ will return and bring the world to an end and His kingdom to its consummation. A concern about the end of the world, the resurrection of the dead, the final Judgment, and the final goal of all men need not imply anything not found in Roman and Protestant thought. This was largely true of the eschatology of Spittelmayr,[210] Schiemer,[211] and Schlaffer.[212]

The fact that the *Geschichtsbuch* and the *Kunstbuch* contain no tracts with an eschatological orientation is perhaps due to the abuse of eschatology by Thomas Müntzer and the Münsterites. This

201 See Section B: The State, in the previous article, "The Life and Teachings of Hans Hut," *MQR*, July 1959, pp. 198 ff.
202 *Bayern* I, 48.
203 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 64, 70.
204 *Ibid.*, 97, 124.
205 *Ibid.*, II, number 8, pp. 26-27 (MSS).
206 Johann Loserth, ed., *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der oberdeutschen Taufgesinnten im 16. Jahrhundert. Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenkfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung von 1542* (Vienna, 1929), 303-304. See Bergsten, 29-32.
207 *Kunstbuch*, 1499.
208 J. C. Wenger, 251-252.
209 J. C. Wenger, ed., *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons c. 1496-1561* (Scottdale, 1956), 517-521, 922-927.
210 *Bayern* I, 50.
211 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 57.
212 *Ibid.*, 90.

might be one of the reasons for the omission of tracts like *Die Aufdeckung der Babylonische Huren*[213] and *Von der Genugthuung Christi* from South German Anabaptists codices.

Schiemer included more eschatological references in his tracts than all the other South German Anabaptists together, but none of them are radical or revolutionary. Schiemer referred to Daniel's three and one-half years,[214] to the fact that Christians will judge the world,[215] to two resurrections,[216] and to other terminology from Daniel and Revelation.[217] If Spittelmayr's version of Hut's Seven Articles[218] was influenced by Hut, they are a further witness to an eschatology that has had its revolutionary barbs removed.

There is no simple and consistent answer to Hut's position on the dating of the return of Christ at three and one-half years after the Peasants' Revolt, or concerning the invasion of the Turks and the annihilation of the authorities. Hut admitted that he had taught these things before he was baptized, and it is possible that some of this crept into his ministry in Franconia; but there are no signs of it during his activities in Austria or after the Martyr Synod. The fact stands that Hut was not responsible for transmitting these radical and revolutionary ideas to the South German Anabaptist movement.

Conclusions and Summary

The South German Anabaptist movement received its initial impulse from the Swiss Brethren through Balthaser Hubmaier. The decision to break with the traditional church pattern and to begin gathering a voluntary church based on believers' baptism was first made in Zürich. Historically the evidence is strongly in favor of relating the Anabaptist movement that mushroomed forth in many parts of Europe to the Zürich origins.

It would be quite unhistorical, however, to interpret South German Anabaptism as a simple continuation of main-line Swiss Anabaptism. First, Balthasar Hubmaier is not typical of Swiss Anabaptist dissent. He did not accept the implications of the basic plea for the separation of church and state and its concomitants: nonresistance, nonparticipation in government offices that use force, and the nonswearing of oaths. Secondly, the only dependence of Denck on Hubmaier is in the question of adult baptism, and possibly concerning the Lord's Supper and church discipline. Even without underestimating the crucial character of believers' baptism as the symbolic

213 *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, number 6 (MSS); also Hans J. Hillerbrand, "An Early Anabaptist Treatise on the Christian and the State," *MQR* XXXII (1958), 28-47.
214 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 56.
215 *Ibid.*, 54.
216 *Ibid.*, 57.
217 *Ibid.*, 75.
218 See Appendix II.

starting-point for the Anabaptist dissent, it does not follow that much of the spirit of Swiss Anabaptism was transmitted from Denck to Hut during the three or four days that Hut was in Augsburg at the time of his baptism. This is substantiated by the fact that the writings and confessions of Hut and Denck[219] make no reference to the Swiss Brethren.

This means that though Swiss Anabaptism was a year and a half old when Hut was baptized, he benefited very little from its experience besides the basic initiative in calling for a believers' church, i.e., a free church. In the eight months that Hut spent in Franconia immediately after his baptism he worked out, in the heat of his evangelistic efforts, the implications of this one basic insight received from the Swiss. It is no wonder that traces of an excited, though basically peaceful, chiliasm crept into his fiery preaching. Not until his return to Augsburg in February 1527, but particularly during his stay at Nikolsburg in April and his attendance at the Martyr Synod in August 1527, was Hut able to test his position and theology in an encounter with other leaders of the Anabaptist movement. It was in Nikolsburg and Augsburg that Hut first met some Swiss Anabaptists in the persons of Jakob Gross, Gregor Maler, and Jakob Wideman.[220]

Hut received his basic motivation and incentive to baptize from Hubmaier through Denck, as well as his view of the Supper as a memorial and the necessity of discipline in the church. This was enough to make Hut's life and thought a critique of the *corpus christianum* and a dissent against the state-church pattern. Hut saw clearly the implications of voluntary religious association and the need for a brotherhood type church with sharing, but his early preoccupation with eschatology seems to have prevented him, during his brief pilgrimage as an Anabaptist apostle, from seeing clearly all the implications of the separation of church and state. His own life was consistent with the basic tenets of the Anabaptists as they were later crystallized in the writings of Pilgram Marpeck, Peter Riedemann, and Menno Simons, but his confession in prison, though not outrightly antagonistic, demonstrates some confusion and inconsistency.

Hut's basic acceptance of the "free church" principle was re-

219 Hut's only reference to brethren in Switzerland is a criticism of legalism concerning dress of which some marginal Anabaptists of St. Gall were guilty. This is not typical of Swiss Anabaptism in general.

220 In comparing the best representatives of Swiss and South German Anabaptism it seems that the basic orientation of each is the same and that there is no fundamental question on which their respective positions are incompatible. The difference between the opposition that each group faced and the difference between the types of writings that are available from each group, give the impression that Kiwiet (*Marpeck*, p. 148) was right in suggesting that the Swiss Anabaptist testimonies tend to sound biblicistic, whereas the writings of the South German Anabaptists are more theological. This difference should not be divorced from the fact that the comparison is usually made between the earliest statements of the Swiss and the later documents from South Germany.

sponsible (1) for his transformation of Müntzer's morbid view of suffering into a positive concept of the imitation of Christ in a life of discipleship; (2) for a change from Müntzer's individualistic view of the Spirit, new revelations, and dreams, to a view of the Spirit as a gift to the church; and (3) for the modification of Müntzer's revolutionary eschatology into peaceful, though urgent, expectation of the return of Christ.

It is impossible to separate the contribution of Hut's life and activity as an Anabaptist from his thought and theology. He was a dynamic leader and a creative thinker. Besides his opposition to *sola fide* theology, his emphasis on *Nachfolge-Christentum,* and his martyr-theology, he is responsible for injecting some new seminal ideas into the Anabaptist movement that bore fruit after his death. An important contribution, which was at the same time an example of the close relationship of his life to his thought, was his view of the apostolate. Although missioners had gone forth in the Swiss dispersion, the apostolate was more fully worked out and given a more central place in the Anabaptist movement by Hut's work, as is shown by his witness and work in Austria and at the Martyr Synod. The Hutterites, more than any other branch of the Anabaptists, picked this up and became the greatest missionary church of the sixteenth century. Hut's emphasis on community and sharing also played, in a special way, into the hands of the Moravian Hutterite Anabaptists.

Hut's stress on the covenantal character of baptism and the church was another insight that bore fruit among Anabaptists, this time among the South German brotherhood of which Pilgram Marpeck was the most outstanding leader. Hut's concern for the unity of the church as expressed in his open letter is also reflected more directly in Marpeck and the South German Anabaptists than in any other branch of the movement. Hut's two tracts were written anonymously and constitute the earliest selections in a rich tradition of brotherhood theology (*Gemeindetheologie*) that is just beginning to be probed by scholars and of which the *Kunstbuch* and the other writings of Marpeck, Scharnschlager, and Maler are prominent examples.

It was through his influence on these two groups, the Hutterian Brethren and the Marpeck brotherhood, that Hut made his contribution to the Anabaptist movement and to the great Free Church tradition of Western Christendom.

HUTTERITES REVISIT EUROPEAN HOMESTEADS

EXCERPTS FROM THE TRAVEL DIARY OF DAVID HOFER

*Translated and edited by Robert Friedmann**

The Smaller Chronicle or *Klein-Geschichtsbuch*[1] of the Hutterian Brethren bears the following two passages which have a certain relevance for the topic of this study.

> On April 8, 1941, our dear and faithful brother, Rev. David Hofer, of Jamesville Colony, Manitoba, passed away in the Lord. In 1937 he and his brother-in-office, Rev. Michael Waldner, went to Europe for a twofold purpose. First they wanted to be of some assistance to the (Society of) Brothers then being expelled[2] from their Rhönbruderhof in Germany and nearly ready to move entirely to England; and second, they wanted also to revisit their old Hutterite homesteads in Central Europe. After their return the two brothers wrote a report which reflects their experiences in Europe and which exists as a mimeographed manuscript. God may grant David Hofer the deserved eternal rest.[3] And then on page 498 we read again. "On January 23, 1947, the faithful Brother, Rev. Michael Waldner, main preacher of Bon Homme Colony, South Dakota, passed away in the Lord, more than 77 years of age."[4]

Then the editor, A. J. F. Zieglschmid, adds:

> I remember so well how I met both David Hofer and Michael Waldner in Chicago at the Railroad Station when they returned from their European trip in 1937,[5] and how greatly I enjoyed having both brethren as my guests in my home in Evanston, Ill. . . . Waldner was a wonderful man in the best sense of the word: noble, helpful, and kindhearted. May God grant him his eternal reward.[6]

A trip abroad by Hutterites is a real event and is by no means lightly undertaken. Much consultation and discussion went into this project when an urgent appeal for help arrived from the Bruderhof in Germany late in 1936. What is today the Society of Brothers was then the well-known Rhönbruderhof in Western Germany, established by the late Eberhard Arnold, an ordained elder of the Hutterian Brethren. For a few years the Nazis allowed them to carry on their own way of living, precariously to be sure. But in the long run totalitarianism cannot countenance any kind of nonconformity; the days of the Rhön brothers were numbered. Some of them had sought

* Dr. Robert Friedmann is Professor of History and Philosophy at Western Michigan University.

1 *Klein-Geschichtsbuch*, ed. A. J. F. Zieglschmid (Philadelphia, 1947); hereafter cited as *KG*.

2 See the account of the expulsion by the Nazis in the article "Rhönbruderhof," *Mennonite Encyclopedia* IV (Scottdale, 1959); hereafter cited as *ME*.

3 *KG*, 493.

4 *KG*, 498.

5 In late September.

6 *KG*, 498.

refuge in the tiny Principality of Liechtenstein, between Austria and Switzerland, where they established high up in the mountains the most uneconomic Almbruderhof as a temporary makeshift. Others had proceeded directly to England, where the rough foundations were laid for the Cotswold Bruderhof, a more permanent settlement but extremely poor and of uncertain future. The Hutterian Brethren in America, in the main the Schmiedeleut group, followed with concern all these developments, and after long deliberation decided unanimously to send two elders to investigate in person what help might best be offered to their hard-pressed confreres. And so the long and uncertain trip was begun, accompanied by the good wishes and blessings of all the Hutterites. That the occasion of a stay in Europe should also be used to revisit the old places in Moravia, Slovakia, and Transylvania, whence the Brethren had been expelled nearly two hundred years previously, was at first not visualized but came almost naturally to the Brethren in due time as a sort of by-product of the first purpose of help.

Thus on January 27, 1937, the trip was started from the Bon Homme Bruderhof in South Dakota, and was successfully concluded eight months later, on September 26, 1937, at the same Bruderhof. During the following winter David Hofer drew up his *Reise-Bericht* (Travel Diary), which Michael Waldner then revised and supplemented. The result is a book of 91 mimeographed pages, highly interesting and valuable. No part of it has thus far been published. The major text is by Hofer; the appendix with excerpts from Michael Waldner's personal diary was unfortunately missing in the copy which this editor was permitted to use.[7]

Of this elaborate Diary[8] the present translation has selected only the section on pages 55-82 dealing with the visit of the Brethren to their old homesteads in Moravia, Slovakia, and Transylvania. All the rest of the valuable manuscript was omitted, not because of a lack of interest but because of the special purpose of the present publication. The intention is not to add a chapter to contemporary history concerning the expulsion from the Rhönbruderhof by the Nazis and the subsequent imprisonment of certain brothers (later freed), or to report the understandable embarrassment of the two

7 A word of thanks should go to Rev. Joseph Waldner of Rosedale Colony at Mitchell, South Dakota, who in great kindness allowed me to keep the manuscript in his possession for quite a while so that I, with the good help of my wife, Betty Friedmann, could produce a translation of those parts which appeared to me the most interesting.

8 The title of the manuscript is as follows: *"Ein kurzer Bericht von unserer Reise nach Europa.* Wir kamen erst in England anr dann furhren wir von dort nach Deutschland, Liechtenstein und allen Ländern unserer lieben Vorväter, ausgenommen Russland. Diese grosse und beschwerliche Reise wurde von mir, David Hofer, und von Michael Waldner den 27. January 1937 von Bon Homme Brudergemeinde, S.D., angetreten, . . . und am 26. September desselben Jahres beendet."

American brothers at being present at the execution of this affair, unable to grasp what was actually taking place. Thus this entire German adventure is intentionally omitted. Omitted are also sections of the Diary of a more personal nature, such as the visit at the Almbruderhof in Liechtenstein, and the visit with Professor Fritz Blanke, church historian, in Zürich, Switzerland, and the return trip. This report is centered on the situation at the old Hutterite homes in East-Central Europe, describing what has remained physically and, more important, humanly. Earlier reports about the "Habaners"[9] indicated the meager survival of some Hutterite remnants.[10] To encounter them again and to learn what is still alive of that ancient life is certainly of great value. Also some remnants of the old craft of pottery could be observed. Even personal recollections were not altogether dead in Transylvania, which the forefathers had left in 1767, one hundred and seventy years prior to this recent visit.

This article is further selective from the antiquarian-historical angle, and general observations concerning land and people and agriculture, etc., were cut out when not definitely needed for the context. The Brethren were sharp observers and were always guided by a fine sense of decorum and loyalty which saved them from many a troublesome experience. It might be of interest to learn that the visit in Moravia did not pass unnoticed. The *Tagesbote,* a newspaper of Brno, the capital of Moravia, August 21, 1937, published a remarkable account by a reporter, E. Reichel, "Wiedertäufer besuchen ihre alte Heimat." In passing it might be well to mention that at this time the Sudeten-German area of the Czechoslovakian Republic was in a state of great excitement; one year later, in September 1938, the German annexation of this area took place.

The trip of the Brethren, however, occurred in the semi-peaceful days of 1937. In 1938 the country was partly dismembered; in 1939 Hitler took over the Czech part and made the Slovakian part a sort of satellite state. Soon total war followed lasting until the complete collapse in 1945. Then the reaction set in, a hatred and persecution of the Germans, nearly all of whom were summarily expelled from Czechoslovakia and soon also from Rumania (Transyl-

9 See article "Habaner," *ME* II.

10 I visited these Habaner Hofs in Slovakia in 1925 and reported about them in a study, "Die Habaner in der Slovakei" in *Wiener Zeitschrift für Volkskunde,* 1927, Heft 3 (11 pages), an excerpt of which was given in a speech before the annual Conference on Mennonite Cultural Problems, published in the *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference on Mennonite Cultural Problems,* held at Freeman, South Dakota, August 27-28, 1946, under the title, "The Fate of the Hutterites in Europe," 61-65, where reference is also made to my article in *Mennonite Life* (July 1946), "Christian Love in Action: the Hutterites." In 1938 Professor Zieglschmid also visited the Habaner Hofs in Slovakia, the result of which is his study, "Die ungarischen Wiedertäufer bei Grimmelshausen," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* June 1940, 352-387, and English excerpts of it in *PMLA,* December 1939, 1031-1040.

vania being a part of the latter). The peaceful Habaners[11] (certainly completely unconnected with Sudeten Germans or Transylvanian Saxons) were driven from the country, unless they declared themselves 100 per cent "Slovakian." No recent literature gives us further insight into their fate.[12]

The Diary shows what had not been known heretofore, namely that also in Moravia much more of old memory and tradition has been preserved than could have been anticipated in view of the fact that since 1622 no Anabaptist has lived in that country. In Velky Levary (Grossschützen), Sobotiste (Sabatisch), and Kosolnik (Kesselsdorf), all three in Slovakia, the inhabitants of the respecive Bruderhofs had kept their sixteenth and seventeenth century dwellings remarkably well in repair; all the old houses were thatched with straw mixed with clay. The high attics were still inhabited as of old. Quite a bit of ceramics (Habaner wares) was still extant[13] but almost nothing was for sale. Wherever the Brethren called to visit they encountered extreme friendliness and hospitality. They soon discovered that their own German dialect is a sort of Tirolean dialect, even though there had been no Tiroleans in the group since the late sixteenth century. The newcomers of 1756 to Transylvania were Carinthians, but they too adopted the Tirolean-Bavarian dialect still spoken at all American Bruderhofs and well understood both in Slovakia and Transylvania. Of settlements in Transylvania no reports whatever existed prior to this visit of 1937.

One remarkable lesson comes out of this story, the discussion of which should conclude this brief introduction; namely, the unbelievable tenacity of tradition. One might have assumed that the big exodus of the Hutterites to Russia (1767 ff.) and the enforced conversion to Catholicism of those who remained had completely eradicated all lines of tradition, and that language imperialism (Czech and Rumanian) and the first World War, together with the impoverishment of the peasant class, might have extinguished these old ways and traditions. But 170 years (1767-1937) could not eradicate this venerable tradition. It is remarkable, for example, that remnants of

11 Max Udo Kasparek, "Habanerhöfe in Südmähren" in *Südmährisches Jahrbuch,* 1957, 92-94, where we find a report about the last Habaner Hofs which became victims of the expulsion of 1945. Another brief study, also by Max Udo Kasparek (who is well acquainted with the Habaners), deals with "Zur Tracht der Wiedertäufer in Mähren und der Slowakei," in *Südostdeutsche Heimatblätter,* V (1956), 91-95, in which study the dress of the Anabaptists is discussed, in part by means of Habaner wares.

12 I surmise that many Habaners remained even after 1945, renouncing their original German tongue. When I visited these colonies in 1925, only the older folks could still speak German, while the younger ones, learning Slovakian in school, lost their parental tongue more and more, even though in 1937 (and with Zieglschmid in 1938) a conversation in German was still possible.

13 See Robert Friedmann, "Hutterian Pottery or Haban Fayences," in *Mennonite Life,* XIII (1958), 147-152, with many illustrations, and "More about Habaner Pottery," *ibid.,* XIV (1959), 129 f.

the communal form of living had not died out (common mills, bakeries, forges, etc., and even a common treasury chest) and that until very recently the brethren in Canada and the United States built their houses exactly as it was done and is still being done in Velky Levary, etc. The brethren had no trouble in finding their way, helped everywhere by local "historians." Of books they found none. Since the late nineteenth century no new codices are said to have been discovered,[14] even though I am fairly positive that there are still a few codices around in castles and old council chambers and some peasant cupboards. The libraries of Bratislava, Esztergom, Budapest, and Brno, as well as those of Cluj (Klausenburg) and Alba Julia (Karlsburg), both in Rumania, do have a wealth of such codices, which were violently taken away from the brotherhood, and many more simply burned or stored away in church attics. We hear of one woman who had burned armloads of such books since 1918. Of the precious Habaner wares the visitors were able to buy only a few jugs (*Krüglein*) of modest design, while all the beautiful show pieces are today in the big folklore museums in Bratislava or Budapest, or in private collections of Czech or Hungarian connoisseurs.

Even though external forms of tradition have been faithfully preserved up to such small details as clay floors in the kitchen strewn with yellow sand, the spirit has long been lost. The idea of the Hutterite "narrow path" had no appeal to these East-Central European peasants, and the idea of mission has vanished completely. Thus the Brethren were glad to return via Vienna to the familiar scenes of America after but a few weeks in that general Eastern area. It was only a visit and not a challenge for a new beginning.

THE DIARY

July 12, 1937. Almbruderhof, Liechtenstein

Hans Zumpe, the elder, had just returned home from a visit at the Cotswold Bruderhof in England and reported today to the assembled brotherhood of the Almbruderhof that the Brethren in England had decided that the "Habaners" in Slovakia should be visited and that the true doctrine of community of goods be spread among them. This proposition was gladly accepted by all; and it was suggested that since the two Hutterite preachers from America, Michael Waldner and David Hofer, were here at the colony, this trip be undertaken at once with them. For they were the true descendants of the forefathers in Moravia and Slovakia. Everybody agreed that Hans Zumpe himself and his wife Margaret should go with these two brothers.

. . . With grateful heart we accepted the offer to undertake this un-

14 The last codices came to the Brethren in America around 1893 by a Habaner Pullmann from Slovakia who had found these books and now brought them over on a visit. But this visit itself did not bring any further action—he was friendly and then departed again, for good.

expected extension of our trip, the expenses of which were to be paid by the brotherhood.

July 20. At five o'clock in the afternoon the four of us left the city of Vienna, Austria, and went by steamboat down the Danube to Pressburg,[15] the capital of Slovakia, where we arrived at 8 p.m. The next morning we went to the mayor of that city, whom Eberhard Arnold had visited once before. He was very kind to us and showed us all around; then he directed us to the museum. Here we saw the artful pottery pieces which our forefathers had made in Levar-Grossschützen (called Habaner fayences), altogether thirty-eight pieces, plates, jugs, and all kinds of household utensils; we also saw other handiwork of our forefathers such as woodwork, winepresses, all kinds of implements, and of course also the handicraft of the women, mainly embroideries.

Afterwards we were shown the jail where, as they told us, our brethren once had languished. We went deep down underground and finally came to three cells called the "black cells." The first one was four paces by three and hardly five feet high, being vaulted. Two chains were fastened to the wall and there was only a wooden block to serve as a chair. The other two were still smaller, three paces by two, and had but a stone to sit upon. I sat upon all of them, in remembrance of the dear brethren. There was no ray of light, no fresh air, and it was damp and cool. I shuddered to think that here these loyal witnesses to the truth had lain and suffered. These cells are still called by the people the lion's den, the gypsy, and the black hell.

From here the guide took us to the top floor of the building, which was still more gruesome to see. It was a torture chamber of past centuries with all the instruments by which these poor people were cruelly tortured. The guide told us that here many Hutterites had to suffer terrible martyrdom and eventually bitter death, since this building was the seat of the court for the two Slovakian villages of Sabatisch and Levar or Grossschützen.[16] All these sights weighed heavily upon us and we sent deep sighs to our dear and gracious God, being mindful that these brethren had suffered so severely for no other reason than for the sake of their faith and the glory of their heavenly Father. He alone knows what may be in store also for us. We considered it a special grace that the opportunity had been opened to us to visit these places of which we had read so much in our old Chronicles.

July 21. The mayor of the city of Pressburg gave us his car and had Dr. Ovidius Faust[17] take us to the village of Levar[18] some ninety miles northwest of the city, where the brethren used to live in community of goods. This trip meant a great deal to us, and we were deeply moved when we arrived at the center of the former Bruderhof. This Hof is situated on a slight elevation, the houses around a central court neatly whitewashed, are about 67 feet long and look very nice and tidy with their high thatched roofs. The inhabitants[19] were extremely kind to us and readily invited us to come in. First we looked around the living rooms[20] on the ground floor, then we went up to the second floor to see the bed-

15 Now Bratislava.

16 Sites of former Bruderhofs.

17 Dr. Faustus was the city archivist.

18 Velky Levary or Grossschützen; compare my article in *ME*, IV (1959). Dr. Ovidius Faustus is well known to all researchers in this field. He was archivist of the City Archives of Bratislava, and was tremendously interested in Haban folklore, having visited these people many times and having enriched the local museum by many happy findings. He was very helpful to me in 1925, and to Professor Zieglschmid in 1938.

19 Now called Habaner.

20 *Stuben*.

rooms[21] under the high roofs. The entire structure, dating back to the 1600's, demonstrated the great skill of our forefathers and showed what good craftsmen they were. All told, there were five such old buildings. Next to these living quarters is situated the potter's house and workshop;[22] this and the mill went down at their rear to the creek of Levar named Rudava. In the mill we saw five old millstones and they told us that once it had seven; but the mill is no longer in good condition and is beginning to crumble. Situated next is the grinding mill[23] and the cutlers' workshop.[24] One of the workshops of this Bruderhof shows the date 1604. Near by is the oven or bake house and the fountain, whose water we tried; it was nicely cool and clear.

The *Stuben* in the living quarters are 14 by 16 feet and the *Oertlein* are somewhat smaller, 10 by 12 feet, having room just for one big bed and two chairs. The roofs are beautifully preserved and perfectly tight, made of straw with clay intermixed in several layers. They are said to be absolutely fireproof. The floors downstairs are exactly the same as we used to have them until recently in our American Hofs, namely of stamped clay or loam with yellow sand strewn on top.[25] They told us that last year the government had checked these houses and had found that, although three hundred years old, they would still be good for another three hundred years.

Then we visited the Vorsteher of that Hof by the name of Walter who received us very kindly and showed us the money chest of the community[26] which was heavily braced with iron ties. I was anxious to see some old writings, but at this moment Dr. Faust came into the room, whereupon Walter closed the chest and that was the end. Next Walter showed us the "chapel" where the brethren had been compelled nearly 200 years ago to recant their faith; of course, this chapel is Catholic. On the square in front of it is the pillory where those who refused to become Catholics were martyred. In the cemetery of Levar one finds many markers which bear Hutterite names such as Walter and Baumgartner. On one marker we read that one Elias Walter was buried here in 1848 and his wife Judith in 1849. All the Hutterites buried in this cemetery were Catholics, but those who had remained steadfast in their faith were buried at the other end of the village, namely on the common pasture. This burial ground, however, is no longer in existence. Walter told us also that they are not allowed to sell or give away the smallest thing of their forefathers, and that he should not even have shown us the old community chest. We saw also a cross near the Bruderhof indicating the limit beyond which no brother was allowed to be harmed.

Late in the evening we returned to Pressburg.

July 22. Today Dr. Ovidius Faust showed us the Library of the Canons of the Cathedral Chapter of Pressburg (*Bibliothek des Domkapitels*) which supposedly holds also a number of Hutterite handwritten books. We were surprised indeed to be permitted to see these treasures, since otherwise they are not shown to the public. One of the Canons (*Domherren*) led us through the church up to the third or fourth floor opening heavily locked doors. Finally in a dark room he showed us a beautiful manuscript but did not permit us to hold it in our hands. So we could not really find out what it contained but we thought back to the time when all these treasures had been taken away from our forefathers by the Jesuits.

21 *Oertl.*
22 *Hafnerhaus.*
23 *Schleiferei.*
24 *Messerschmiede.*
25 Called *Fletz* or *Flötz.*
26 *Gemein.*

July 24. Today Dr. Faust took us to Sabatisch, about 80 miles from Pressburg, another place where once our forefathers had a Bruderhof. Here he showed us the tower from which the clock and the bells of the community had been taken away during World War I. This tower had been built by our ancestors some three hundred years ago.[27] Next to it is the community mill which still works for the entire village. Then we went to a man by the name of Baumgartner, who received us very kindly. The arrangement of the houses here in Sabatisch was about the same as in Levar, remarkably neat and clean. The people there still have a great deal of ancient household goods, likewise woven clothes and old writings, but nothing of significance. There exist still three community wine cellars from the time of our ancestors. The cellars, the mill, and the inn are still held in common; at the inn we saw a long table of oak, also a work of our forefathers many centuries ago. We were urged to sit down and then the inhabitants of the Hof brought us beer and wine and soon the whole room was filled with people of this Hof. The women brought food, more than we could eat, and we greatly enjoyed this delightful hospitality. There was much talk about the olden days (to be sure, in the German language); and they told us that the woods are also still a common possession. We soon found out that there are about forty families at the Hof in Sabatisch who are the descendants of our forefathers. They showed us also an old, beautifully written document, a Hausbrief, the charter or privilege of this Hof, signed by a certain count.[28] Likewise they showed us a book by Andreas Ehrenpreis of 1659. One of the men in Sabatisch, a certain Joseph Müller, had been in America in 1888, visiting our brethren in Wolf's Creek and Bon Homme, South Dakota.

They showed us also the dye house (*Färberei*) of the Hof, which has not changed at all since the days when our forefathers were expelled or made Catholic by force; it is still in use. They gave us a little scarf as a souvenir.

The ruins of the castle Präntsch[29] can still be seen on the hill about three miles north of the village; it once belonged to the manorial lords of the Bruderhof. Altogether, this Hof has thirty-nine houses; among the families living there we found the names of Pullmann, Tschetterle, and Baumgartner. They showed us also a deed of the year 1595 concerning a vineyard, signed by the steward Baumgartner. We tried very hard to get some of the old pottery of our forefathers but were unsuccessful, simply because the Slovakian government buys at a good price every piece which becomes available (for their museums), and does not allow anything to be taken out of the state. We saw a man who was just digging near the old pottery workshop, because even potsherds and broken pieces sell for a high price today.

July 25. Today we left Pressburg (or Bratislava as they call it now) by train for Nikolsburg in Moravia. We arrived there at one p.m., and

27 Sobotiste, German *Sabatisch;* see again my article in *ME,* IV; the clock tower was erected in 1753 (Beck, *Geschichts-Bücher,* 574). Illustrations may be found both in Friedmann's 1927 article (above, note 10) and in Lydia Müller, *Kommunismus der Mährischen Wiedertäufer* (Leipzig, 1928).

28 *Hausbrief*—a charter or privilege. There are two such Hausbriefe extant, one of 1613 and one of 1640. The 1613 Hausbrief is published in excerpts in Beck, *loc. cit.,* 364 note, while the 1640 Hausbrief is published in full by Zieglschmid (who saw it personally) in his *Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Brüder* (1947), 128 note. A Hausbrief for the Velky Levary Bruderhof of 1588 was published by Zieglschmid in the *Germanic Review,* April 1940, 81-97.

29 Branc, Branitsch, Pranitsch, Berenc—the old castle overshadowing Sabatisch, the seat of the manorial lords of this estate, today a ruin. More about it in Zieglschmid, *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder* (1943) 265 note.

soon after, we climbed a mountain about one thousand feet high. From the top of it some local people showed us not less than twenty-four places where once Bruderhofs had existed, such as Neumühle, Auspitz, and others. They showed us also the ruins of the castle Falckenstein, about two miles south of here, with its tower, where once in 1539-1540 our brethren languished. The castle of Nikolsburg, originally belonging to the lords of this place, the Liechtensteins, stands in the center of the town.

When late in the evening we returned to our hotel we found there Hans Zumpe (who had not been with us in the afternoon) in conversation with two men. After supper, Hans Vetter asked us whether we would like to go with him to a meeting. I asked: "At a church?" "No," he said, "it is a political meeting." Whereupon I said, "No, I am tired and will go to bed." The next morning the hotel manager told us that our friend Hans and his wife Margaret had fared badly last night, for they had been arrested by the police and at 3 a.m. their belongings had been confiscated.[30] We went to the place where they were kept and found them very exhausted and downhearted.

Since we could not be of any help to them, we decided to continue our program and visited the old castle of the Liechtensteins. From the top of its tower the guide showed us the former Bruderhof where 25 to 30 houses were still standing, well preserved. He could only tell us that about two hundred or more brethren used to live there prior to 1600. About that time the castle was taken over by Franz von Dietrichstein (later a cardinal), who in 1600 or so used the Hutterite brother Zobel as his personal physician. They also showed us old documents and contracts (briefs, deeds) in the archive of the castle. In the showrooms we noticed the most magnificent and artful draperies and cloths we had ever seen,—that is the splendor of the world.

At 2 p.m. a police officer came to our hotel room and politely asked to see our passports. He then inquired about our relationship to Hans Zumpe. He told us that the latter had to go to the higher court in Brünn, for the police considered him a German spy. This news upset us greatly. We went to see Hans Vetter right away, who was deeply depressed; I said, "What now?" He first thought to call Cotswold Bruderhof long distance, but I suggested calling Dr. Faust of Pressburg. In any case we decided to stay two more days in Nikolsburg to see how things would develop. Hans and Margaret were taken to Brünn by a police officer.

As we were restless, we did not like to stay in the hotel room but decided to visit the former Bruderhof, which we found easily. The people who lived there allowed us to look at all the thirty houses, but the Hof as a whole was not as stately as the ones at Levar and Sabatisch. The alleys were narrow so that no car could pass through. One woman asked us whether we were also "Anabaptists," and I said yes. She said the people who used to live here had been Anabaptists too, but they were no longer here. I inquired about old books and manuscripts, but she did not know of any.

On our way back we passed the courthouse and in front of it met one of the officers. We asked his advice as to how to help Hans Vetter. At first he was reluctant, but finally he said: "Since you are foreigners, the best thing to do would be to go to Brünn, to the Higher Court, and tell

30 Apparently this was one of those affairs between the Czecho-Slovakian government and the Sudeten-German (Nazi) party of Henlein. Zumpe could certainly not have anticipated this situation, if one remembers that his brothers of the Rhönbruderhof had been expelled by the Nazi officials. Now he was being held as a sort of German sympathizer with the Sudeten-German Nazi Party, or even as a spy or agent provocateur.

them that Hans Vetter was your guide. Maybe they would release him for your sake." We thanked him and returned to the hotel.

July 27. We went to Brünn by bus. It took us quite a long time to find the Higher Court (since not everybody understood German), and in it the judge ("obersten Polizisten"). He promised us that Hans would come down soon. And after a short while, he and Margaret really came down the steps. After a brief talk with them they returned to the Court and we to our hotel. At 3 p.m. Hans told us by telephone that he was free. We thanked God that He had helped us out of this great tribulation, and waited patiently for the return of the two.

July 28. Early in the morning Margaret came to our door to tell us that Hans was very sick. When we came to his room, we found him with a high fever. We felt badly about it, indeed, but we finally all decided that it would be the best for the two of us to return to Nikolsburg in order to visit the different Bruderhofs in the vicinity during the next few days until Hans recovered.

Our great Chronicle tells the story how Jakob Wideman together with 200 brethren had left Nikolsburg in 1529 to camp at a desolate place. There they spread a coat and everyone put upon it whatever he possessed. Then they continued their march until they reached the village of Gross-Nembschitz, Moravia, near Nusslau, from where they sent four men to Austerlitz to find a place for the brotherhood. We thus decided to visit all these places too, to gain an idea where our brotherhood had actually started. Truly, we found all of them as described in the Chronicle. But in Austerlitz and Auspitz (today just towns) we found very little reminding us of the former Bruderhofs.

Our next stop was the Neumühle. In the Golden Period of our forefathers [1560-1590] this place had been a real center of the brotherhood where they settled serious conflicts and reached important decisions.[31] Many of our old books [codices] had been written and bound at the Neumühle. Originally the name of the place had been Nikolschitz on the Thaya River, but when in 1551 the brethren bought an old mill there and rebuilt it, everybody spoke of the Neumühle or new mill. We found it to be a lovely place. Two wells of the former Bruderhof still stand, one at the end and one in the center of the village. There still exist about thirty thatched houses, and the mill still shows the date 1551 engraved upon a stone. Today this mill is a big building, the greater part of which has been modernized, but the old part, which was used by the brethren, is still well preserved. We saw also the fish pond of the Bruderhof and were told that fishing is still a community affair. The former schoolhouse of the brethren is in the center of the Hof and is still being used as a nursery for the small children. Next we saw the clock tower, about thirty feet high, which likewise had been built by the brethren during the Golden Period. Near by is the brewery, now unused, and they told us that it was also once part of the Hof. Last we visited the graveyard, which is kept in good condition. According to our Chronicle the following bishops are buried here: Hans Kräl, Klaus Braidl, Sebastian Dietrich and Ulrich Jausling.[32]

The peasants around still have some faint memory of the former inhabitants of the Bruderhof, telling us that they had been the best cutlers, potters, and scythe makers, also tanners. I asked a friendly peasant woman whether she might have any book of our forefathers, whereupon she answered: "Had you come before 1918, I could have given you many

31 See the excellent article "Neumühle" by Dedic, *ME* III.

32 I suppose that also the bishop Peter Walpot was buried there.

books, but when the new state was established we had to take everything which was German from our houses and burn it, a whole armful." The same day we visited several more places where once had been Bruderhofs, such as Pohrlitz, Tanowitz, Bramowitz, Bergen, Wisteritz, and Auspitz.

July 29. Today we took a trip to Falckenstein. The castle is situated on a rocky mountain about 2000 feet (?) above the village of Falckenstein. It was in 1539 that 150 brethren had been taken prisoners in the near-by village of Steinabrunn and subsequently put into the dungeon of the Falckenstein castle. We visited all these drab places and holes. The outside walls are six to eight feet thick and thirty feet high. Fifty feet inside the first wall is a second one. We could guess where the dear sisters had climbed these walls and waved to their beloved husbands who, chained together by two and three, were driven away to the galleys on the sea. To see these places and to tread upon such ground excites one's heart, for the hymns of the Falckenstein prisoners we learned and sang in school, when we were children. Therefore we were filled with awe and reverence when we could observe the very place itself.

The village of Steinabrunn[33] we could see in the distance deep down in a valley. Almost everywhere there are well-kept vineyards on the slopes and the wine is rather cheap in this area. That same evening we returned to Nikolsburg, which is already in Moravia. The inn-keeper showed us proudly his wine cellars, and afterwards served us wine in two jugs which he said came from the Brethren of Transylvania.

July 30. We went back to Brünn to see how Hans and Margaret were faring. We found them all right, and on the same morning we all four visited the museum of the city. There we saw again many things which came from our forefathers; in particular we admired the pieces of pottery which came from Levar and Sabatisch, some of which were real marvels of artistry. Likewise we saw all their house furnishings, and their dresses, also their farm implements, wine presses, their looms and spinning wheels, and their equipment for dying wool. There was an entire potter's workshop, complete with kiln, a forge, and a cutler's shop. We saw also a complete equipment for linen-weaving, and many of the finished products which they had made for the manorial lords.

That same day at six in the afternoon we arrived in Austerlitz. This is the place where once Jakob Hutter had been active and where a large community had developed. The schoolteacher of Austerlitz showed us around (speaking, of course, German as well as Czech) and told us many stories pertaining to the history of our forefathers there. He showed us also houses in the neighborhood of Austerlitz which were all that was left of the Bruderhof of the 1500's. Several years ago they had found an old Bible which he then read secretly, for the Catholics had put a high penalty on those who would read unauthorized books. In the village of Austerlitz proper nothing had remained of the Bruderhof. The teacher told us also that it is known that our forefathers had been the best barbers [barber-surgeons] and doctors who brought health to their lords.[34] Here in Austerlitz used to be a bath-house and a hospital, mainly for the brethren but also for many of the noble families who were glad to have some medics around.

August 2. Today we arrived for the second time in Sabatisch in Slovakia. At our first visit we had noticed that they had been afraid to show us their antiques in the presence of Dr. Ovidius Faust; now we came

33 Both Steinabrunn and Falckenstein are situated in Lower Austria, not in Moravia but near the border.

34 See my article "Medicine, Hutterite," in *ME* III.

back to talk to them and have a look at their old treasures. We visited the Baumgartner family and were most hospitably received. They served us a delicious meal which we enjoyed doubly in the awareness that we were sitting in the very dining room of our forefathers and at the table which they had made with their own hands perhaps three hundred or even more years ago. On one of the beams of this room one can still see the date 1781 and the names A. Baumgartner and Andreas Wurz.

We saw also the Catholic chapel which the Jesuit had built for them and where he is buried. Then we went to the City Hall. It was there, according to Baumgartner, that the brethren were interrogated by the Jesuits and decisions were passed concerning the fate of all the Anabaptists. In the council room was a table like the one we had dinner on and also an old clock made by our forefathers. I tried very hard to buy this precious clock but he resisted, saying that it was worth more than gold.

From there we went to the cemetery outside the former Bruderhof toward the North. In one corner there are two big walnut trees, said to go back to our ancestors' time. Once there had been many tombstones, but they all had been carried away, save one which Baumgartner had salvaged. On it you could read: Tobias Seibel and the year 1755. This cemetery, we assume, is the resting place also of our dear brothers Heinrich Hartmann and Andreas Ehrenpreis, and we were deeply moved in our hearts when we remembered these loyal fighters for their faith. Then we visited also the mill of Sabatisch which shows the date 1739.

That same evening we arrived at Kesselsdorf,[35] 32 miles from Sabatisch, and stopped at the mill. Soon there was a crowd around us, but unfortunately we could not talk to them as they all were Slovaks. Finally there came one who understood also German. He showed us four houses near by, still called the Habaner Houses, around the square. Adjoining them the potter's workshop used to stand; the man told us that one day the wind felled a tree and when the place was cleaned up they found a piece of glazed earthenware. Soon people started digging and found out that this must have been the workshop of the potter. When they dug still deeper, they found two big rooms filled with various potteries of great beauty.

They told us also that a subterranean tunnel[36] was discovered which, no doubt, the brotherhood used in case of enemy attacks, for the Turks and the Tatars had more than once invaded this area east of the Small Carpathian Mountains. Around Kesselsdorf and the Carpathian Mountains much blood had been shed in these days, and on top of a hill we saw a monument commemorating all those who had died here.

Before we left Kesselsdorf they gave us as souvenirs some potsherds which they had excavated. Then we drove to a near-by village to visit the man who had carried out all these excavations. Since we were descendants of these Kesselsdorf brethren, he showed us without hesitation his finds. It was a great treasure which he had collected and he told us that a museum had offered him a great sum for these pieces, but he would not part with them for any price. We admired these things and talked about them until well into the night.

August 5. At about 11 at night we arrived in Pressburg and stayed at the Hotel Koch. Next morning we went to the library of the Lutheran-Evangelical Church, of which we knew that it contained a number of old

35 Kesselsdorf (or Kosolnik), article in *ME* III. In Kesselsdorf most of the 17th century sermons had been written; see also the article "Kuentsche" in *ME* III.

36 See article "Lochy" in *ME* III. Most likely these tunnels go back to the middle of the sixteenth century. Illustrations of them in *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, article "Lochy" by Cernohorsky, *ML* II, 679-682. The pictures give a weird impression.

writings of our forefathers. The minister there showed us willingly the most beautiful of these manuscripts, called *Ein Schön Lustig Büchlein* of 1581, written in a exemplary handwriting by the brother Hans Zuckenhammer.[37] Besides that we saw also other handwritten books, one of 1577, full of epistles and other testimonies of faith. One book came from Levar and tells the story how our brethren had moved from Slovakia into Transylvania 1621. Those who remained were later made Catholic in the time of the Empress Maria Theresa.

The next day, August 6, at 11 in the morning we left Pressburg for Transylvania; we went by steamship down the Danube and had a lovely, quiet trip until we reached Buda-Pest, the most beautiful city in all of Hungary. Unfortunately, I got sick there with dysentery. After all remedies had failed, the hotel manager came and promised to cure me. His wife cooked for me a wine-soup—two cups of wine and two eggs—and that at once stopped my illness. Never before had a remedy worked so quickly.

Then we continued our trip down the Danube on the boat *Francis Joseph*. When in the 1750's Empress Maria Theresa had driven the Lutherans out of the Austrian province of Carinthia and compelled them to transmigrate to far-away Transylvania on the eastern edge of Hungary, they, too, went down the Danube the same way. Not long thereafter they joined our dear forefathers in that country and became Hutterites. That was the reason why we chose that route by boat. And because we knew that they had ben disembarked at the place Peterwardein,[38] and had been under guard in the fortress there, we decided to stop at this place too and visit the fortress.

The road to Transylvania leads from Peterwardein via Temesvar in the "Banat" province, and our forefathers, who had been transported by boat to Peterwardein had then been shipped to Temesvar and further on by wagons.

With God's gracious protection we arrived in Peterwardein August 10, at 5 p.m. after having crossed the Yugoslavian border without any trouble. The trip, which in the 1750's had taken three months, we accomplished in three days. We made plans to continue the same route which our forefathers had taken, but first wanted to stop also briefly at the city of Novi-Sad opposite Peterwardein on the north bank of the Danube. For in this city there is a large congregation of the Church of the Nazarene[39] which we planned to visit. They are a nonresistant church who refuse to go to war and for that reason are not tolerated by the Yugoslavian government and are badly oppressed. Three hundred of their young people are at present in prison for conscience' sake to serve a sentence of ten years. And when these ten years are over and if they again refuse to serve in the army, then they are sentenced for another ten years. That is the reason why this Church is considering emigration to other countries, but the government does not grant them a free exodus either. These Nazarenes had also applied to the government to allow them alternative service, if need be twice as long as regular military service, but they received no response. It appears that the government just wants to eradicate them altogether as a "dangerous sect," reminding us of all the suffer-

37 The "Article Book" of 1577. The Codex Zuckenhammer has been known ever since the days of Beck, and it is most likely the best written one (as to penmanship) of all the existing copies. See "Article Book," in *ME* I.

38 Now in Yugoslavia, but formerly in Hungary.

39 Church of the Nazarenes: this church is also known as Apostolic Christian Church, Neutäufer or Fröhlichianer. Compare the respective articles in *ME* I, 138 f and II, 414 f. It is well known that this Nazarene Church spread from Switzerland to the Balkans. They are not Anabaptists but have friendly relations to the Mennonites and in many regards hold similar tenets.

ing of our own forefathers when they were expelled from Moravia in 1622.

They are said also to have practiced community of goods in earlier days, but by now we found nothing of that. The man in charge to whom we talked appeared to us rather timid in matters of faith. Several times he repeated: "Things do not look good with us. But what shall we do?" I told him that they were no longer firm enough in their faith, yielding this and that to the authorities, and of that the government had become well aware. Therefore it only increased its oppressive measures. . . . With a heavy heart we took leave of them and continued our trip.

August 10. At 2 p.m. we left Novi-Sad by train in the direction of Transylvania, crossed the border between Yugoslavia and Rumania, and eventually arrived in Temesvar at 10 p.m. It was the hottest day of our trip and we were quite shocked by the poor conditions which we could observe all around. The railroads were poor and dirty, and the peasants were clad in rags, running around barefooted. Next morning we continued on an electric train through the province of "Banat." The land became more fertile but the population was definitely unclean and of low education. The farther we went into Transylvania the more the landscape changed into a hilly wooded country. At midnight of that day we arrived in Hermannstadt, the former capital of Transylvania, a fine city of a population of about 16,000.[40] There are many Germans still living in this city called the "Siebenbürger Sachsen," which may account for the unusual tidiness of the place. We stayed here for four days, but in the beginning did not achieve much. Then we got acquainted with a certain Dr. Kieltz, a modest man but apparently of great influence, who gave us several letters of recommendation which proved to be of great help to us. For the Rumanian officials are not too well disposed toward the Germans, either natives or visitors.

For example, Hans Zumpe had had a copy of the *Klein-Geschichtsbuch* of the Hutterian Brethren forwarded for us to Hermannstadt that we might use it on our planned visits at Alvintz and Kreutz. But at the postoffice they made difficulties in handing it out to us; without the letter of recommendation by Dr. Kieltz we would hardly have gotten it. We were very glad to have this book with us as it served us well later on on our trip.

August 13. We went to see the prison where many of our forefathers had languished in the 1750's to 70's. We found it easily on Sass Gasse 25, since everybody knows it; it is situated in the Jewish quarters. The prison—or rather fortress—has a high wall all around. When we arrived at the "big" gate we were very pleased to find it unlocked; so we entered the outer court. Soon an official came noisily down the stairs and shouted at us in the Rumanian language, apparently asking what we were doing here. As he could not understand us he called his wife down who was German. We told her our purpose and after much grumbling and talking back and forth he left us to ourselves and went back up the stairs. Thus we could look around at our leisure, which pleased us very much. We

40 Hermannstadt, or in Rumanian Sibiu, formerly the center of the Transylvanian Saxons or Germans, who incidentally were all staunch Lutherans in a Rumanian-Orthodox environment. Its library has the original manuscript of the diary of Father Delpini (S.J.), in which his dealings with the Anabaptists are described in detail, also his "methods" of conversion. Compare the very good description by E. Novotny, *Die Transmigration ober- und innerösterreichischer Protestanten nach Siebenburgen im 18. Jahrhundert (Schriften des Institutes für Grenz- und Auslanddeutschtum an der Universität Marburg,* Heft 8, Jena, 1931). In this work also an older and less known book was digested, namely, Wilhelm Schmidt, *Die Gründung des katholischen Waisenhauses in Hermannstadt* (Hermannstadt, 1869). One may rightly assume that the entire "Saxon" tradition, the entire German folklore and also their church life are now a matter of the past.

went through many rooms, corners, and hallways, where we thought our poor brethren might have lain for so many years. We visited also the woolen mill where Johannes Hofer and Martin Glanzer had worked together with our sisters in compulsory labor. We also noticed certain holes in the wall near the exit and guessed that it was here that they kept the keys, as described in the Smaller Chronicle. In the courtyard we saw also a big well from which, no doubt, the brethren used to drink water. From our *Klein-Geschichtsbuch* we know that the following brethren and sisters had lain in this place: Matthias (or Hiesl) Hofer, Rosina Büchlerin, Paul Tschetterle, Michael Hofer (who died in this prison), Annele Wipf, Martin Glanzer, Margaretha Glanzer, Barbara Glanzer, the wife of Paul Glanzer, who had himself escaped from prison.

The city keeps this prison and the woolen mill connected with it in good condition, but they are no longer in use. It was a great experience for us, indeed, to visit this place and we were deeply moved to see the rooms where our dear forefathers had suffered so much and yet had remained steadfast.

August 14. Today we went to see the Library. There they showed us several books which dealt with the story of our brethren and their unshaken steadfastness. But of their own writings they have nothing. The next day, August 15, we went by car to the village of Alvintz, about fifty miles northeast of Hermannstadt. It was a Sunday morning and what struck us particularly was the fact that both in Hermannstadt and in the villages everywhere they had swept the streets clean. We arrived at Alvintz early in the forenoon, about 9 a.m., and soon inquired about old writings of our forefathers. We were told of a certain man who was said to have such writings in his possession. Luckily, we found another man who understood some German and who now guided us to a direct descendant of our forefathers by the name of Joseph Kuhr. To him we went right away.

When we entered his home, I told him straight into his face: "Do you know that you are one of us?" He answered: "Yes, I know."—"Where do you know it from?"—"My grandfather got it from his grandfather, and so our father (whose name was Samuel) told us likewise that we are descendants of the brotherhood which used to live here in Alvintz."—I told him that it is written in our Smaller Chronicle that his great-grandfather owned a lovely vineyard and an orchard.—"Yes," he said, "We still own it and I can show it to you if you care to see it. I could also show you the house where my father used to live."

Thus we went by car about two miles to Old-Alvintz, crossing on the way the Maros River near the place where the Bruderhof had once been. Because the spring floods of this river inundate the entire valley, doing a lot of damage, they had torn down all the buildings of the Bruderhof in 1857 and had rebuilt their village on a little knoll near by. Since, however, the house of the great-grandfather Kuhr and next to it the workshop of the potter had been on a little elevation, the descendants had left the house untouched where it was, as a sort of memorial. It is a small house, 14' x 30', with but two rooms. It is still well preserved. No staircase leads to the attic. "Here," said Kuhr, "our great-grandfather hid when he returned from the Ukraine to fetch his children." We stayed in the house for about an hour and talked of past times. One man who owns a garden next to the potter's workshop found a number of earthen jars which our forefather had made. Hans Zumpe bought them for a trifle.

All in all Joseph Kuhr was so glad about our visit that he did not know what to do for us. He introduced us to his oldest son and went

with us through the whole village (of New Alvintz). Of course we were most eager to meet the man who was said to have books of our forefathers, but, since it was Sunday morning, he was on his way to church and we had to wait for his return. In the early afternoon we all went over to his house, but the man, being a Rumanian, refused very unkindly to show us his possession. All our begging did not move him and he remained adamant, so that we finally had to leave without having seen whatever he might possess. Kuhr was very much embarrassed but there was nothing he could do.

As far as Joseph Kuhr could remember, there had been 22 families all in all descending from those brethren who had stayed behind in Alvintz when our brethren left Transylvania in 1761. As a small community they had always been segregated from the rest of the village and had been able to keep some semblance of community even though they had been compelled to change their faith. Today, however, there remained but three families of this group and they are not too popular, being of German origin in an otherwise strongly Rumanian surrounding. Their names are: Berthold Kaiser, Joseph Schillinger, and Joseph Kuhr. The majority of the population is Rumanian, a few gypsies and very few Germans, here called Saxons. No one but the Kuhrs speak German anymore. I suppose that they all are Catholic like everybody else, since we saw crucifixes everywhere in the houses and along the roads.

We paid a short visit also to the village of Mühlbach in the district called Grosspolen, where once some of our brethren used to live. From there we drove on to the village of Kreutz, another place of memories of our forefathers. It is a very mountainous area with dense woods all over, in the midst of which we found the small village of Kreutz. On a little hill we at once saw the Lutheran church joined with a fortress-like building, and soon learned that this is an old "fortified church"-building (*Kirchenburg*) dating back to the time of the terrible Turkish invasions. Recently the church building proper had been completely renovated.

Soon we met the Lutheran minister of this church, a young man who spoke German, but when Hans Zumpe asked for permission to see church and castle, he balked at first and was reluctant to give us such permission. But when we told him that we had come from far-away America to visit places of our forefathers, and that they had been persecuted not by the Lutherans but by the Jesuits in the days of the Empress Maria Theresa, he brightened up and said: "If that is the case, of course, you may see whatever you wish." He guided us through the fortified section of the compound (what looks like a castle) and showed us in particular the room where our brethren were occasionally housed, a big place near the outer wall. This fortress used to be occupied in wartimes when the enemy (Turks, Tartars, Rumanians) invaded the land, and our brethren often stayed there for months until the enemy had left again.

The young minister listened with greatest interest to the story of our ancestors and readily promised us to help us getting the Diaries of the Jesuit Delpini (who had brought so much hardship upon our brethren) since he himself was well at home in the library of Hermannstadt. For it is known that these Diaries contain all his dealings with the brethren in the 1750's and 1760's, and to read his version of the story would be of greatest interest to us. Mr. Urschel (that was the minister's name) became extremely friendly by now and wanted to keep us overnight or, at least, for supper.

Not long after this visit in Kreutz we received a letter from him addressed to Hans Zumpe, part of which we want to insert at this place:

I shall never forget the hour of our encounter and talks at the entrance of our church-fortress in whose center the Cross looms highly. I met four people, two of whom were patriarchs with traits of serene peace, in whose eyes I could read the inner peace and composure which their souls had found in the service of our Lord.

I am convinced that only those can put across the spirit of Christ who themselves have got some of this spirit, but once a man has it he radiates like a sun which emanates its joyous rays and yet does not lose its glowing power.

It meant a great experience to behold the soul of a Christian ready to fight and if need be to suffer for God's sake, and to find bliss in this dedication.

The same spirit I have also found in your *Klein-Geschichtsbuch* and other sources which I read. They all are testimonies of Christian martyrs who have found their heavenly foundations. I trust that the *Klein-Geschichtsbuch,* which you have sent me, will continue to be a source of inspiration for myself and others.

With God's blessings, yours gratefully,
Andreas Urschel.

This church-fortress of Kreutz we found exactly as it is described in our Smaller Chronicle, even the hole in the outer wall where the key used to be deposited.

From this fortress the brotherhood began its great exodus on the 3rd of October 1767, at 10 o'clock in the morning, after having lived in Kreutz for six years in peace, love, and unity.[41] The first day of their trek they reached the village of Schweiz where they remained until nightfall, all in all 67 souls. Next day they arrived in the village of Repes.

We also wanted to see all these places, all the more as the only road toward Kronstadt, our next goal, leads through this valley. Seeing the steep, wooded mountain slopes and the narrow valleys, we could easily understand that it was possible for the brethren to hide from the authorities (who would never have allowed them to leave), particularly since they travelled only at night.

After Repes the brethren reached the big Alt River where they were prevented from crossing because they had no valid passport. So they continued along the northern bank of this river until they reached a forest. Next day (so we learn from the *Chronicle*) God helped them to cross the river to the south in the following fashion: the two covered wagons with their belongings, which they had hired, crossed at a ford, while the brethren were ferried over in a little boat.

We ourselves followed exactly their route as it is described in all details in the *Chronicle,* and proceeded toward the East.

The next leg of their march brought the brotherhood to the Kronstadt forest; it was a strenuous hike all through the night so that some even fell asleep while walking. Near Nussbach they camped for a few days. We too stopped there and bought some watermelons. Continuing toward the border of Transylvania (the eastern end of the Hapsburg empire) the brethren avoided all villages; the hired teamster had sent one of his servants as a guide who led the group through fields over hill and

41 Compare *KG,* 299. Here Johannes Waldner, the author of the book and an eyewitness of this pathetic exodus, writes the moving words: "The church of the Lord existed in Kreutz for six years. One lived there in the simplicity of Christ, in the discipline and practice of the first apostolic church, in the unity of the Holy Spirit; one kept community of goods and practiced separation from the world as far as possible. One practiced the ban and excommunication against the wicked and disobedient ones, one also practiced the right discipline of the children." This is then the epitome of the entire Hutterite ideal of life.

dale. Everyone was completely exhausted and without any strength left; so they had to camp again in a dense forest. In the meantime brother Joseph Kuhr and another brother went to a near-by village to see the men who were to guide the group across the Carpathian Mountains down into Walachia, Rumania, a trip known for its dangers. But the men were not at home and they had to wait a few days, which worried them grievously.

In the meantime a hunter came along and asked who they were. The brotherhood implored him not to give them away, but the hunter crudely refused. They offered him brandy which he finally accepted after much ado. Then he left and began yelling, so that the group became still more afraid and downhearted. Brother Andreas Wurz encouraged them, however, asking them not to lose heart and to put all their trust into God's help.

Eventually, October 13, 1761, the guides arrived and the brotherhood began the most difficult part of their trek, led through an almost impassable wilderness, where they were fairly certain not to meet any hostile person. They had to climb a high mountain pass covered completely with dense woods, and to make it worse, this climb had to be done by night. One can hardly imagine a trip more filled with hardship and sadness, climbing up with small children on their backs, with young and sick and weak and old ones, and all the heavy baggage carried along as best they could. We have seen that area and now know how steep and wild it is.

On August 16, we four arrived in Kronstadt, after having completed the trip from Kreutz by car all along the route of that great march. The heat was oppressive and we felt most uncomfortable partly also due to the unbelievable uncleanliness everywhere. In railroad coaches, for instance, the peasants take along their chickens, pigs, and all kind of fowl to be sold at the next market, producing an awful stench all along. We arrived at Kronstadt around 7 p.m., and tried in vain to find some lodging, asked at least at twenty hotels, and thought already of returning the same night. Then at supper one woman to whom we had talked before offered us her own room, and thus we decided to stay.

August 17. We hired a car to follow the path across the Carpathian Mountains which our forefathers had taken. Formerly there existed no road at all, but after World War I the Rumanian government (which now rules also over Transylvania) built a difficult highway which winds up the steep slope in hairpin curves. On this road we also passed a cemetery of war dead, reminding us painfully of the ravages of war. It is said that between 1600 and 2400 soldiers were buried here, and one could see row after row of crosses.—We drove up to the top of the pass, and if it had not rained that day, we could have looked down on the Walachian plain whither our ancestors once went.

The next day, August 18, we decided not to continue our trip further into Rumania and perhaps the Ukraine, but to return home. Hans Zumpe also received a telegram that some children in the family were sick. Thus we took a train from Kronstadt and went by the shortest route back to Vienna in Austria.

Rumania has the poorest railroad service which we ever had experienced in all of Europe. When we crossed back into Hungary near Arad, things changed considerably, like night and day. In Budapest we stopped but for an hour and then continued toward the Austrian border. At 9 p.m. we finally arrived in Vienna and stayed at the Hotel Wimberger.

(Continued on page 346)

MENNO SIMONS AND THE ROLE OF BAPTISM IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

VINCENT G. HARDING*

INTRODUCTION

When a man takes (or is forced into) the polemical stance and continues to write from that position for a quarter of a century, it is likely that those who read while running will pay greatest attention to his negative and more spectacular words. They will note his controversial attacks and the innovations which sometimes grow out of them. But his quiet presuppositions and basic understandings will often be lost amid the tumult and the shouting.

Generally, this has been the case with the writings of Menno Simons, especially as they concern the doctrine of baptism. His attack on infant baptism was so violent, his defense of adult baptism so aggressive, and his discussion of the controversy was so pervasive in his writings that we have often failed to ask an important question. The query takes several forms: What did Menno consider to be the role of baptism in the Christian life? What did he think actually took place in baptism? Or even more simply: Why should a Christian be baptized?

This paper will therefore be an attempt to explicate Menno's underlying doctrine of baptism, to seek answers to the multi-faceted question. This intention does not imply, however, that it is possible clearly to separate his doctrine from the controversial situation. It is in fact, impossible to do this, for Menno wrote no words about baptism which were entirely outside the polemical arena. Some were closer to the center, it is true, but all were part of the controversy. With this understanding in mind, it is perhaps still possible to catch some vision which can carry us into the center of the situation and lead us to undergirding tenets.

In conducting this inquiry, it seems fitting to use Menno's own method. He was, above all else, a biblical exegete—often polemic, sometimes misguided, but this was the way he approached the problems on which he wrote. And, in a sense, it was imperative that exegesis be the way of life of a man who believed that "without the command of the holy Scripture nothing righteous can be done and nothing pleasing to God can be practiced."[1]

* Vincent G. Harding is associate pastor of the Woodlawn Mennonite Church, Chicago, Illinois, and a doctoral student in church history at the University of Chicago.

1 John C. Wenger, ed., *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons* (Scottdale, 1956), 242.

Such a method will be of use in examining his own writings. Thus, we will begin with a "text," one which seems to capsulate and hold in tension the central portion of Menno's teaching on baptism. And in the light of the rest of his writings on the subject, and with an awareness of the nature of his own experience, we will hope to make clear the "plain sense' of his words. There will also be, throughout the paper, a critical analysis of his doctrine.

In the investigation, attention will be focused on three documents, written during a four-year period (1537-1540), in which Menno gave his most extended treatment to the specific question of baptism. Indeed, one of them—"Christian Baptism" (1540)—was devoted entirely to the subject. The others are "The New Birth" (c. 1537) and "Foundations of Christian Doctrine" (1539-40). All of the works of Menno used in this study appear in English translation in a recent publication of *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons.*[2]

I

When Menno published his "Foundation of Christian Doctrine" in 1539-1540, he had in mind, evidently, two basic audiences. He wrote for the circle of faith and those on its periphery, for he hoped to build them up in doctrinal correctness and strength. He wrote, too, for the eyes of the rulers, defending on biblical grounds the beliefs of his Dutch brethren, seeking to bring a halt to persecution.[3]

It is clear that both of these groups were being addressed in the section of the work which dealt specifically with baptism, and it is from this section that the "text" is taken. Menno, in denying the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, wrote,

> Baptism is a sign of obedience, commanded by Christ, by which we testify when we receive it that we believe in the Word of the Lord, that we repent of our former life and conduct, and that we desire to rise with Christ unto a new life, and that we believe in the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ. . . .[4]

Here were the major strands in Menno's understanding of baptism: obedience to a command, testimony of belief, pledge to live in newness of life. They were closely related in his mind, and they provide the bases for this inquiry.

Even before these words are examined in detail, certain emphases stand out. Above all, it is obvious here that in his understanding of the baptismal act Menno concentrated on the will and action of the believer. There was no danger of passivity in his doctrine. Every verb in the passage has the believer as its subject. In this tremendous

2 Wenger.
3 *Ibid.*, 104.
4 *Ibid.*, 125.

stress on the conscious activity of the Christian there was little room for any basically mystical understanding of baptism. In fact, it is generally evident that Menno gave God no role, except—as we shall later see—before and after the believer's act. This emphasis was surely a part of the antipedobaptist polemic but it was not solely that.

It was no accident that Menno's first words dealt with obedience to the command of Christ, for the role of obedience was at the center of his understanding of the Christian life. Perhaps this is understandable in a man who believed sincerely that he had spent most of his earlier life in disobedience. Perhaps it is partially explained by the fact that he, himself, had been hunted and had seen men killed because they had obeyed.[5]

Whatever light his personal experience sheds upon the situation, it is clear that this was his primary focus. Obedience was required of all disciples. With this emphasis, he could describe the church as "those who are regenerated, renewed and converted; who hear, believe and keep all the commandments and will of God. . . ." And he could carry it closer to its logical conclusion by writing, "The kingdom of God and the will of God do not consist in external ceremonies, but in the willing obedience to the Word of God. . . ."[6]

Thus Menno believed that ceremonies like circumcision and later baptism served primarily to test the obedience of the believer. He said, "In the outward ceremonies as such God takes no pleasure, but he has commanded them because he ever requires of us faithful obedience."[7] Baptism was a command of God through Christ. This was clear to him through Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:16, and he used these two verses in his arguments more frequently than any others.

In addition, Christ had set the example by his own baptism. (Following the doctrine of Melchior Hofmann, Menno taught that the Christ's baptism was his preparation for the Wilderness, for the temptations and trials to come. And, like Hofmann, he understood this to be the way all disciples had to go.[8] Even in their obedient following of this example, disciples gained capacity for more obedience. For Menno believed that Christ's baptismal preparation came through his very act of submitting and resigning his will to the will of God. Thus it was with the Christian, in the very act of submission, he prepared himself to follow more obediently.) So, there was in

5 *Ibid.*, 5-29, 668-674.
6 *Ibid.*, 234, 235.
7 *Ibid.*, 237.
8 *Ibid.*, p 120. It is not clear whether Menno was aware of the affinity of his understanding with that of Hofmann who wrote earlier. See George H. Williams and Angel M. Mergal, eds., *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers*, Vol. XXV in the Library of Christian Classics (London, 1957), 189,191.

Christ a double imperative for every believer: baptism was the command of God, through Christ, both in word and in example. For Menno, it was "the Word and will of the Lord, that all who hear and believe the Word of God shall be baptized. . . ."[9]

When Menno sought to defend Anabaptism, it was always this motif that he stressed—obedience. And when he directed his words to the rulers of lands where Anabaptists were suffering persecution he could say,

> My dear sirs, we seek nothing in this baptism other than to obey our beloved Lord Jesus Christ, who has taught and commanded us this with his own blessed mouth. Matt. 28:19; Mark 16:16.[10]

Certainly this was a defense against persecution, but it is also fair to see it as a statement of central belief. And perhaps this was the natural stance for the man who emphasized discipleship. For him, the primary mark of the disciple was not love (although he did not neglect it) but rather obedience which was required by God. Therefor he could write, "Through obedience everything is received. . . ."[11]

There is certainly an example here of the way Menno's own experience and context shaped his understanding of baptism. For when men had to suffer and die for obedience to one command of their Master, it was not hard to overemphasize the importance of that particular command. Thus could Menno see in baptism a concentration of the whole life of Christian obedience. And it was most assuredly for him "a sign of obedience, commanded by Christ. . . ."

II

Willingness to suffer martyrdom was again being used as a test of obedience, just as had been the case in the earlier days of the church. But in Menno's time, as before, it was more than a test of obedience, it was a test of the entire quality—even the existence—of the individaul's life of faith. Here was the danger.

For Menno, obedience—concentrated in the act of baptism—followed inevitably from true faith. Thus he could ask, "If your faith is as you say, why do you not do the things which He has commanded you in His Word?"[12] The implication was clear: obedience was the test of faith, of real belief. Basically it was again (as it has appeared in every Christian generation) the problem of the relationship of faith to works. And Menno wrote

> All those who truly believe, . . . neither regard nor see lords, princes, . . . nor their wives, children, flesh, blood, placards, or any other

9 Wenger, 121.
10 *Ibid.*, 236.
11 *Ibid.*
12 *Ibid.*, 96.

> threats; nor even life or death. They embrace without reservation . . . not only the outward baptism, but also all the works of love and the fruits of righteousness . . .[13]

It is in this context of thought that we must read the words of the "text": "we testify when we receive it that we believe in the Word of the Lord, . . ."

Since the act of baptism gathered to itself the life of obedience, and since Menno considered obedience to be a test of faith, baptism thus assumed the role of a test as well as a "testimony." That which began as an act of obedience became also a test of faith. Such an understanding was clearly implied in the typical, rhetorical question that Menno asked his persecutors in the "Foundation": "If you are a genuine Christian born of God, then why do you draw back from baptism, which is the least God has commanded you?"[14]

This came to be his primary polemical use of the act of baptism. According to him, those persons who "do not believe the Lord's Word . . . are earthly and carnally minded." These, he said, were the disobedient ones who fought against Christ and the Scriptures and asked, "What can water benefit us?" If those persons were really believers, said Menno, if they were really ready to forsake all they had for the "glory of the Lord," then "they would undoubtedly not murmur so and dispute against God." Rather, he concluded, "they would be ready . . . to receive the commanded baptism. . . ."[15] Here baptism was clearly not only a test of faith, but a test of the action of God in renewing the individual's life. What Menno allowed himself to say here and elsewhere was that baptism was a means whereby the true and false Christians could be separated. Baptism was a judgment.

Again the act of baptism was considered a distillation of the Christian's life of obedience, obedience which Menno took to be proof of salvation. In understanding all this, it is important never to forget the meaning of adult baptism in Menno's time. For to become an Anabaptist often *did* involve a tremendous conviction, and it demanded an act of commitment which might well signalize one's entire attitude toward discipleship.

Nevertheless, even with this context in mind, it is still evident that Menno fell into a trap at times. It was the same trap that is open for every group in the Church that stresses (perhaps rightly) some particular aspect, some neglected part of the Christian life and belief. Almost inevitably this one part becomes paramount and distorts all else, even their own beliefs.

13 *Ibid.*, 246.
14 *Ibid.*, 138.
15 *Ibid.*, 349.

Menno's most extended treatment of baptism as a test and testimony of faith and belief is found in "Christian Baptism,"[16] and it will be examined here in some further detail, laregly to draw attention to the context and to the difficulties such a view raises.

Using the language of covenant theology, Menno claimed that we are accepted into God's covenant without any signs if "we accept by faith and walk according to the will of the giver." But then he went on to say that to those "who are . . . by faith accepted by God into the covenant . . . God has given his ceremonies and figurative signs as a test of the genuineness of their faith. . . . For those who are obedient unto God are his friends."[17]

All this grew out of an attempt to prove that children could not possibly show such obedience, but it put Menno in a strangely unbiblical stance. For he continued: "If we do not perform [the ceremonies], or if we perform them differently we have by our disobedience neither covenant nor promise."[18] Basically, this seems to be saying that God gives his grace to us, then tests us with the ceremonies, and if we fail to observe them, or observe them incorrectly, then he takes back his grace and leaves us empty-handed.

It is, to say the least, an uncomfortable position, and one feels that it grew largely out of Menno's attempt to deal with the old and new covenants in a unilateral way, a result of his polemical responsibilities. For it may well be that part of the newness of the New covenant lies in its very strange freeness, in its failure to have strings attached. But this was not what Menno proclaimed. He wrote, in fact,

> Abraham was circumcised,—and we baptized, because it is thus commanded by God. Whosoever disobeys and opposes the voice of the Lord commanding these ceremonies and despises the performance of them . . . excludes himself from the precious covenant of grace by his disobedience; neither does he prove his faith to be fruitful and living, but on the contrary he proves that it is unfruitful and dead before God.[19]

Here the sign of obedience and the test of faith coalesced. And in this coalescence, there was clearly no question of grace conferred by God in the act of baptism. It was an act of the human will, with significance primarily in the man-to-God direction.

In his insistence on obedience—an obedience centered in the believer's submission to baptism—Menno actually placed his doctrine of baptism closer to a Zwinglian point of view than he may have

16 *Ibid.*, 261 ff.
17 *Ibid.*, 261.
18 *Ibid.*, 263.
19 *Ibid.*, 262.

realized. For if obedience was to be the test of faith, and if faith and obedience were the marks of the Church and of the covenant, then this baptism could be seen as an act of initiation into the Christian Church. And it would be a strange kind of introductory rite, for, with Menno's emphasis on the will, it would be an act in which the believer, through his submission, was actually doing the work of initiation.

An even more important distortion continually appeared in "Christian Baptism." Because it was a key distortion—in Menno's understanding of the relationship of baptism to salvation—it should be noted. At one point, Menno offered an orthodox understanding of salvation that was to be later betrayed by his constant argument for baptism. Writing of "the new birth" he said,

> [It] consists, verily, not in water nor in words; but it is the heavenly, livng power of God in our hearts which . . . if we accept it by faith, quickens, renews, pierces, and converts our hearts, so that we are changed and converted from unbelief to faith, from unrighteousness to righteousness . . . from the wicked nature of Adam to the good nature of Jesus Christ.[20]

Those persons who were so converted, according to Menno, were "the truly regenerate children of God." And to these alone, he continued, God "has taught and commanded the holy, Christian baptism as a seal of faith. . . by which [faith] they receive remission of sin. . . ."[21]

Now, this seems to make it clear that regeneration, salvation, conversion—whatever it is called—comes before baptism. But at the end of that very paragraph, Menno made what was supposedly a summary of what he had said, and listed the order of salvation thus: (1) "the preaching of the Gospel"; (2) the "hearing of the . . . Word"; (3) "faith by hearing"; (4) "the new birth by faith"; (5) "baptism out of the new birth . . . in obedience to God's word"; "and then" he added, "follows the promise"—the promise of salvation.[22] Salvation followed baptism, it appeared.

Even more explicitly, and offering an even more radically baptismally based order, Menno elsewhere stated that,

> We must receive this baptism . . . Otherwise we cannot obtain remission of sinse nor the Holy Ghost. For who has ever received the remission of sins contrary to the Word of God?[23]

Thus he made the order of salvation to read: (1) baptism, (2) remission of sins, (3) the communion of the Holy Ghost. Somehow, because he needed so much to stress obedience, Menno either contra-

20 *Ibid.*, 265.
21 *Ibid.*
22 *Ibid.*
23 *Ibid.*, 244.

dicted himself or made "the new birth," "conversion," "salvation" and "the remission of sins" very different things.

Although the difficulty was not ever really resolved in this work, the same section contained a passage which at least helps us to understand how Menno could get into such a predicament. For he wrote, revealingly,

> If true faith and obedience are separated from each other (as they sometimes are, for instance, in the case of those who grieve the Holy Ghost and sin against Him), then such faith does not profit us, for it has no promise because of disobedience, and is useless and dead before God. Jas. 2.[24]

For Menno, it seems, even *true faith* could be separated from obedience, and when it was, it did the believer no good.

Two difficulties immediately arise out of this understanding. First, one may ask if it is not possible that Menno, in using James as his support, is misunderstanding the statement concerning faith and works? Is James not saying that *true faith* is true because it carries in itself all the others virtues, and therefore a living (true) faith is that which is surely accompanied by obedient works? And in corollary, if there are no works, then there is no true faith?

Secondly, one is uncomfortable in the presence of this passage from Menno because it tends to deny the gift quality of salvation. It tends to make obedience a lever for extracting salvation from God, just as much as Protestantism has ascribed that role to faith. So, both positions face the danger of denying the sovereignty of God.

But even Menno found this ground at times untenable, and he moved from it on the very next page of the work. There he wrote

> True faith is the fullness of righteousness . . . yes, it is the mother which bears all Christian virtues, and by reason of this, the Word of God ascribes everything to it, such as righteousness . . . blessing . . . salvation . . . and life everlasting.[25]

Here was surely a case in which the polemical situation allowed Menno to walk into a trap, one in which even he refused to remain. For if true faith is indeed the mother, it will bear obedience within itself.

Fifteen years later Menno appeared to have become less doctrinaire about the relationship of baptism to faith and salvation. He could write then that "signs or sacraments" were given to the believers "for no other purposes but to admonish and remind us that we should walk in continued repentance, that we should exercise our faith by them. . . ."[26] And at this same time, when he again sought to place baptism in the order of salvation, he wrote,

24 *Ibid.*, 266. 25 *Ibid.*, 267. 26 *Ibid.*, 686.

> All who rightly believe [the message of the Gospel] and are through faith truly converted, changed, renewed and born of God, who partake of the Holy Spirit, these are children of the covenant, graciously accepted of God, and blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; *even before they have come to the sign of baptism* [my italics].[27]

While these later writings represented a change in emphasis (and perhaps in understanding), his central doctrinal works on baptism surely supported the opening words of the "text": ". . . baptism is a sign of obedience, commanded by Christ, by which we testify when we receive it that we believe in the Word of the Lord. . . ."

III

So pervasive was Menno's emphasis on the will and action of the believer that it entered into his understanding and interpretation of the Pauline burial and resurrection cencept of baptism. His words in the "text"—"we repent of our former life and conduct and . . . we desire to rise with Christ unto a new life"—are actually his restatement of the idea. For Menno often used Paul's ideas with his own emphases.

In *The New Birth* the confluence of Menno and Paul is seen in an enlightening way. But it is not only those two who come together, it is also Old covenant and New, as well as Spirit and water. In describing regenerate persons, Menno wrote,

> In baptism they bury their sins in the Lord's death and rise with Him to a new life. They circumcise their hearts with the Word of the Lord; they are baptized with the Holy Ghost into the spotless, holy body of Christ; as obedient members of His church, according to the true ordinance and Word of the Lord. They put on Christ and manifest his Spirit, nature and power in all their conduct.[28]

Aside from the apparent confusion of some of the symbols, Menno here speaks almost as if he were, indeed, not using symbols, but as if the act of burial and resurrection were actually taking place in the baptism of water. Though this is not consistent with what we know of the body of his thought on the subject, it is an interesting outcropping from his earlier writing. However, it is more important to note that even here, in this symbolic language, Menno placed greatest stress upon the action of the believers. The human participants are again the subjects of every verb used in the paragraph. And though baptism is seen as a burial and a resurrection, it is not primarily a God-centered (though it is God-directed) act.

This stress on human action was even present in his use of the burial analogy. For instance, he often made a point of stating that he

27 *Ibid.*, 692. 28 *Ibid.*, 93.

had no intention of saying that baptism implied a cleansing of man's "inherited sinful nature," but rather it was to be seen, he said, as a declaration that "we desire to die" to this nature and destroy it.[29] Central in his understanding of the baptismal "burial" was this emphasis. It was a declaration of intention, a testimony to God and to his church of the believer's will. It was not as with Paul, that we are buried, thus receiving the action. Rather, with Menno it is we who do the acting, we who declare that we desire to die, we who bury our own lives. Generally we take over. This was baptism for him. And, again, one must remember that this emphasis on human action and human will cannot be understood outside the context of the anti-pedobaptist controversy. But it must also be recognized that it was not solely polemical.

So, too, with the second half of the analogy—the resurrection. Actually, Menno placed even greater stress on this in his writings. In fact, he eventually emphasized it so much that he was somehow able to separate the burial of sins and of the old life from the resurrection into new life (just as he had found it possible to separate true faith from obedience). For he wrote,

> It will not avail us anything to bury our sins in baptism if we do not arise with Christ Jesus from the power of sin unto a new life to the praise of the Lord.[30]

(Note, we are not "risen," rather we "arise.")

The new life was important to Menno for several reasons. Part of his aversion to infant baptism had come out of his observation of the lives that were lived around him every day. He saw men and women acting out tragedies of debauchery everywhere he turned, or so it seemed. And all of these persons claimed to have been baptized, to have been buried and resurrected. He could not bear this.[31] So, his emphasis on the need for a new birth was surely a condemnation of his world. It was, of course, a condemnation not unrelated to Menno's own tendencies toward perfectionism.

Again, though, the emphasis on the new life cannot be understood without the light of polemical fires. Infants obviously cannot rise into new life (especially when the action is centered in the individual rather than in God). They cannot declare their desire to rise with Christ. They cannot circumcise their hearts. Therefore, Menno was also saying here that they could not be baptized. These considerations were certainly part of the background for his understanding of the baptismal resurrection. And, actually, in focusing

29 *Ibid.*, 245.
30 *Ibid.*, 122.
31 See, for instance, *Ibid.*, 255.

his attention on sin and the need to turn from sins and to rise into a new life, he was more faithful to the Pauline emphasis than many modern exegetes of the passage. Nevertheless, his insistence on the action of the believer robbed some of the power from the burial and resurrection image, for it again took God out of the center of the action. This was surely not in keeping with the Pauline view.

IV

It would appear at first glance that the final portion of the "text" had escaped the context of controversy, and could be read apart from that background. That is not so. When Menno wrote that in baptism we testify that "we believe in the forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ," he was still engaged in the warfare. For he was then fighting against the belief that remission of sins or any other "grace" of God comes through baptism. Therefore, this final positive statement was actually part of Menno's testimony to what he believed was *not* found in baptism.

A reading of the words which directly followed helps to make this point clearer:

> Not, my beloved [he wrote], that we believe in the remission of sins through baptism, by no means. Because even as by baptism we cannot obtain faith and repentence, so we cannot receive [by baptism] the forgiveness of sins, nor peace nor liberty of conscience. We testify thereby that we have repented and believe in forgiveness through Christ.[32]

This was the radical Anabaptist position being carried to its logical conclusion: baptism "brings" nothing to the believer except an opportunity for him to act, for him to testify, for him to show his obedience to God. It brings opportunity, no more.

And who could act, who could testify, who could obey? Could a child? Certainly not, said Menno. Thus, this final statement of the text, this most peaceful-looking phrase was yet another chance to enter the lists, to proclaim the truth he believed he saw: opportunity —the only "grace" conveyed by baptism—could be apprehended only by rational believers, not by "irrational infants."

It cannot, of course, be claimed that this exegesis of a text from Menno's writings can exhaust his understanding of the act of baptism. Rather, we are saying that the concepts outlined here stand at the center of this understanding.

As a matter of fact, Menno's biblicism would make it difficult for any one key to open the entire storehouse of his conceptions. For tied to the Scriptures as he was, he had to find ways to bring into

32 *Ibid.*, 125.

himself all the richness (and variety, and paradox) of the scriptural references to baptism. And in this light, one final variation on his main theme will be suggested briefly.

As has already been indicated, the idea of the covenant was one that seemed constantly to intrigue Menno. But he wrote on it not only because it was a way of holding together Old and New Testaments, but also because defenders of infant baptism often used the concept to justify their practices.[33] Menno therefore sought to fit adult baptism into the idea of the covenant.

In this setting, he saw baptism as an "outward sign of the covenant" we have with God. This covenant he called (following I Peter 3:21) the "covenant of a good conscience with God" through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. For Menno, the nature of the covenant was such that "the Lord has bound himself with us in His Grace, through His Word," and "we bind ourselves by the outward sign of the covenant in water . . . that we will no longer live according to the evil, unclean lusts of the flesh, but walk according to the witness of a good conscience before Him."[34]

This was another way of looking at the act, but even here one cannot escape the central intention of Menno's writing on baptism. The primary understanding of the ordinance is still in terms of human will and action. And always it points us toward the new life, the new life which we decide to live in obedience to God.

Again one can see the influence of the "great controversy" on this way of approaching baptism. Finally, then, the question can rightly be asked, how would Menno have spoken of baptism had he not been in the polemical role? Ultimately it cannot be answered, but it may be that several excerpts from the later writings have suggested an understanding of salvation and of the sacraments (a word often used by Menno, meaning "sign") which is less centered in the human will and action.[35] And perhaps the change in emphasis was epitomized in these words from a work of his published just seven years before his death:

> Behold we are by God's election through faith in Christ Jesus, and by the impulsion and renewal of the Holy Spirit, incorporated into the body of Christ, which is the true Church, and we become flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone; and this not through any external sign.[36]

33 *Ibid.*, 684.
34 *Ibid.*, 125.
35 Above, 8 ff.
36 Wenger, 693.

CHRISTIAN NONCONFOMITY IN A CONFORMIST AGE

Lloyd L. Ramseyer*

In the days of the early church, Ephesus, a city in Asia Minor, was an important center of trade and commerce.[1] It was also the center of worship of the goddess Diana, and a temple in her honor was located there. Many of its tradesmen made a good living by makings images of the goddess. Not only was it a center of idol worship, but it also was noted as a place of sin and immorality, some of which was even approved and made a part of the worship of the pagan gods.

In the days of Paul, the apostle, a Christian church was established in this center of pagan worship and wickedness. To be a true follower of Jesus Christ, not only must the followers of this new doctrine have a fundamental belief quite at variance with the pagan worship in this city, but to be true to this faith meant a complete break with the moral and ethical practices of the average citizen. Paul's letter to this church was calculated to strengthen them by showing that they were saved through the power and grace of Jesus Christ, that unity among men could be achieved only through the church and faith in Christ, and that faith in Christ meant a complete break with the pagan standard of morality and ethics of that day. Paul describes the pagan way of living and then says, "But you have learned nothing like that from Christ, if you have really heard His voice and understood the truth that He has taught you."[2]

Paul realized that to forsake the way followed by those with whom these Christians were surrounded would be difficult. In the last chapter of the letter he "depicts the Christian in conflict with the spiritual forces of evil in the universe, exhorting him to fight manfully, in the strength of Christ, equipped with the spiritual arms of God himself, for defense and for attack."[3] Our text is taken from this chapter where Paul says, "Therefore take the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and *having done all, to stand.*"[4] He then goes on to describe the type of armor needed for a successful fight against these forces of evil.

In his letter to the Romans Paul also points out that Christians must follow practices different from those of the pagans around

* Dr. Lloyd L. Ramseyer is president of Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio.

1 This is a baccalaureate sermon preached by Dr. Ramseyer at Bluffton College, June 7, 1959, under the title "Having Done All, to Stand," The Scripture references were Ephesians 6:10-20 and Romans 12:1-2 (Phillips translation).

2 Ephesians 4:20, 21 (Phillips translation).

3 *Interpreters Bible,* Vol. 10, p. 608.

4 Ephesians 6:13: Revised Standard Version.

them. In the twelfth chapter, as found in the King James version, he says, "Be not conformed to this world." From this comes the doctrine of nonconformity, a very essential doctrine, but one which has been abused and misrepresented in Mennonite circles by both its supporters and its critics. I particularly like the way this is expressed in the Phillips translation, which says, "Don't let the world squeeze you into its own mold." Rather, he says that we should "let God remold your minds from within." The power of God working in us should make new individuals of us, so that we may have the will and the power to live lives different from those of the non-Christians around us.

Throughout the early church, this separation from the activities of paganism was stressed. There was to be no compromise with the principles and ethical codes of the world. Had there been compromise, it is likely that the new doctrine would soon have become merged with paganism, and the church would have died an early death. The church survived and spread because courageous men and women, possessed of deep convictions, were willing to suffer and die for what they believed. This was true during the persecutions in Jerusalem, persecution and torture in Rome, and up through the day of the Reformation. We owe our opportunity to learn of Christ to those men and women who had the courage of their convictions.

In marked contrast to the injunction to the early church to resist conformity to the world about them, a trait continued in the early church, our own age is called by many the age of conformity. There seems to be strong resistance to being different from the crowd. This change seems strange, in view of the fact that during the early days nonconformity was punished by imprisonment, torture, and death, while in our day it would be punished only by the disapproval of the crowd. Two recent books, often quoted, stress this urge to conformity. One of these is *The Organization Man* by William Whyte, the other, *The Lonely Crowd* by David Reisman. Reisman speaks of this generation as being "other directed," as having our pattern of life set by the crowd. Someone has said that in our day we "merely seek our own appropriate places in the American assembly line."

Perhaps this retreat to conformity with the crowd may be due to the perplexing day in which we live. Life seems so complex, the contending forces seem so great and uncontrollable, and our daily peril of such magnitude that we seek a kind of security in the crowd. With problems so enormous which are apparently beyond our ability to comprehend, much less control, there seems to be so little that

we as individuals can do which would affect the destiny of the world. In this period of tenseness we, as a society, demand conformity on the part of others, just as we feel incompetent to express ideas of our own. Thus through fear we lose not only our opportunity to help direct the ways of man, but also our freedom to express ideas contrary to those accepted by the crowd. Walter Lippmann says we seem to be approaching the time when a whole society or nation "will welcome manacles to prevent its hands from shaking." Another person has said that now, a century after Darwin, "we worry not about the survival of the fittest, but about the survival of anybody." Because of our fears, we conform to the standards of the crowd, and create pressures to mold others into the same form. These pressures are at times intensified by "witch hunts," such as during the McCarthy era, when even to have associated with an individual or group holding radical ideas might be held against one.

Darwin's theory of evolution is not a man-from-monkey theory, but assuming for the moment that it were, Howard Lowry writes in serious yet semihumorous vein, "Looking back a hundred years, through such eyes as Mr. Reisman's or Mr. Whyte's, it would appear that Mr. Darwin's ape has taken a curious turn. He has not been the wild, obstreperous element in us he was feared to be, but rather one whose descendants have shown an alarming capacity to be tamed and engineered into that most dubious of creatures, a thoroughly 'adjusted' human being who has made up to the world, gained the whole of it, caught the five-ten train and lost his soul."[5]

Dr. Lowry believes that this urge to conformity produces an ineffective man, and also a lonely one. In the same article he writes,

> What he cannot conceal is his concern about this growing lonely crowd in our American culture. These people are lonely because the return, the spiritual enjoyment, of their lives is so thin. They lack values and inner resources and have no authentic life of their own. They use the noise of the others to drown the noise of self. They have no chart, no compass and no anchor. They feel no guilt, only a series of small anxieties." Even their "sphere of pleasures has become a sphere of cares." Having no grand and noble aspirations by which to weigh and measure, they waste their days adjusting themselves to things that are not worth being adjusted to. All this breeds sleekness without fibre, ennui, and, at last, a solitary chill about the heart. Such is the new loneliness on a growing mass scale. It is the assembly of the inwardly bereft. And the worst of it is that it is a fashionable kind of loneliness—a loneliness to which men are not resigning; they are making up to it, asking for it, as they join the lonely crowd.

5 Howard Lowry, "The Human Privilege," *The American Scholar*, Vol. 28, No. 2, Spring, 1959.

Waldo Beach, in writing in *Conscience on Campus,* puts it this way:

> The "other-directed" person lives by a kind of "radar", guiding his course of action by the signals he gets as they bounce off other people. Adaptability, adjustment, fitting-in, popularity, acceptance —these constitute his rule of life. Reisman finds that the "other-directed" type is fast becoming the characteristic American way.[6]

Concerning the college student, Beach says:

> Putting the matter religiously, we would say that the college student believes . . . in the doctrine of justification by adjustment. That is, he seeks a kind of salvation by acting in a way he conceives acceptable by his supreme authority, the crowd, hoping to be taken up in his merits and forgiven in his failures, in short, "justified" by his god. His private prayer might be phrased: "Let the word of my mouth, and the meditations of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O gang, my strength and my redeemer."[7]

Putting it another way, Beach says:

> The campus hero is the "nice guy" from the nice family, flat-topped and well-heeled, infinitely adaptable and tolerant, inspired by no vocational purpose beyond that of settling down in the security of a split-level suburban house to raise a family of nice children.[8]

Not only does this urge to conformity result in standardization of moral and ethical codes, it also effectively prevents individuals from championing great causes. No great price is put on conviction, unless that conviction is shared by the crowd. One should never forget that progress is usually made in the world through people who have great and deep convictions and are willing to suffer and, if need be, die for them. A society in which people are reluctant to depart from standards of the crowd is not likely to produce such leaders. Without leaders with deep convictions, social progress is stalemated.

The church itself would never have gotten underway had it not been for the willingness of the apostles to deviate from the standards of the crowd, to live for deep convictions. This willingness to stand for one's beliefs did not end with these first church fathers. Men like John Huss, Martin Luther, Menno Simons, and many others left their mark on the religious life of the world because they were willing to be individualists. Man would never have attained freedom and democracy if it had not been for men like Robert Browne, Roger Williams, and William Penn, who were willing to take chances for great ideals and great convictions. Names like those of Patrick Henry, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln stand out in our

6 Waldo Beach, *Conscience on Campus* (Association Press, 1958) p. 26.
7 *Ibid.,* p. 25.
8 *Ibid.,* p. 103.

own history because they were willing to "stick their necks out" for that which they believed.

There are those who believe that the present generation of college students shows an alarming lack of conviction and concern about current problems. Philip Jacob says, "Students predict another major war within a dozen years, yet international problems are the least of the concerns to which they expect to give much personal attention during their immediate future."[9] Waldo Beach says:

> While Hungarian students were rioting for freedom and being shot down for their ardor, what were American students rioting for? On at least two campuses there were student demonstrations against the football coach because he failed to serve up a winning team. On another campus, students had a mass meeting to agitate for more parking space for their cars. Panty raids have become an expected event in the academic calendar, on the first warm spring night. For the most part, however, American students do not riot for anything at all. . . . If there be any passion common to American campuses, it would be the passion to conform, to play it safe.[10]

Acting as part of a group, rather than as an individual, seems to lessen one's personal responsibility. In a discussion meeting sponsored by the American Council on Education, mention was made of the fact that college pranks used to be pulled by individuals or small groups. Now there are often hundreds participating. Clarke Kerr, President of the University of California, said,

> They do it in crowds of thousands at a time and if there is any question of even minor penalties, the argument of some of the students and some of the people close to them will be, "Yes, but we were not responsible. We were doing it as part of a large group." . . . It is an attitude of "I wasn't responsible for what I did. I did it with a large number of people. I did it with my peer group, and I am not personally responsible for my action. And therefore I should not be held punishable in any way.[11]

However, it seems to be the consensus of opinion that this group action is seldom centered around concern for great causes in our American society, either among college students or among adults, but is centered either around pranks or around things which are of trivial importance in the light of the tremendous problems of our day. Perhaps they are a reaction against a world so troubled and so complicated that neither individuals nor groups know how to take effective action.

There are then two dangers which we face in this urge to conformity. These are dangers to the moral, ethical, and religious stand-

9 Philip Jacob, *Changing Values in College* (New Haven, 1957) p. 6.
10 Beach, p. 100
11 *Spotlight on the Campus* (American Council on Education, 1959) p. 26.

ards of the individual Christian, and to our society as pressures exist which seem to prevent individuals and groups from expressing opinions and standing for deep convictions relating to the problems of our day. Both spring from the urge to conformity. You must resist both if you are to be a Christian in the fullest sense of the word and if you are to use your talents, your education, and your creativity to bring about needed reforms in our society and in the world. In the words of Paul to the Romans, "Don't let the world squeeze you into its mold."

In addition to the psychological trend toward uniformity in our day, two other factors have contributed to squeezing the Christian into the mold of the world. One of these factors is that many people do not take the words of Scripture concerning conduct as seriously as they used to take it. Fear resulting from certainty of eternal punishment for personal evil has a diminishing influence in determining the ethics of our day. The voice of God through Scripture does not seem to come to the individual with the clarity and the certainty that it once did. The other factor is that with the increasing complexity of our age even the serious-minded Christian is less certain as to just what God's will for him is in such an age. The Bible was written when ethics was largely an individual matter. We are now in a situation where many of the things which we do we do as members of groups. We no longer own a factory, but only shares in a factory. We no longer work for a single employer as an individual, we work for a corporation as a member of a labor union, a group which decides some of our ethical principles for us. The implications of our economic acts are no longer between individual and individual, nor even between a corporation and the nation, but also have an influence which is world-wide. If, for example, we want to share our food surpluses with other nations at little or no cost, we must consider what effect the dumping of such surpluses on the world market will have on the markets of other producing nations, and upon the farmers who depend upon these markets for their living.

The first of these difficulties can be alleviated only as we again get a clear concept of the voice of God speaking to us through the Scriptures. We need to take that voice seriously. We need again to give heed to the thou-shalts and the thou-shalt-nots of Scripture. We need to pay renewed attention to the voice, gentle but firm, as it came from the mount, saying "It hath been said, but I say unto you." With this renewed seriousness of approach there needs to be cooperative grappling with the issue of the meaning of the Scriptures for a day of group action and social responsibility. In this search, we

need the counsel and help of those well grounded in faith in the Scriptures and highly educated in the various disciplines, men and women with Christian values and wide experiences. The church must lead us in this quest.

In many cases, however, the church itself has succumbed to the temptation to be squeezed into the world's mold. A larger proportion of our people in America belong to churches than ever before in our history. Our churches are filled on Sunday morning as never before. Yet we are not always clear as to what this should mean in the way of a distinct ethic. We are anxious to increase the numbers on our church rolls, but not always careful enough to insure that as members join the church they will also accept Christian standards of thought and action. We expect church members to abstain from open participation in the most vulgar sins, but we are not always equally concerned about the more socially acceptable sins. As the moral standards of our society change, we seem to be all too ready to accommodate the standards of the church to changing values.

If the church represents the voice of God, it should have a message for our age, for the answer to our problems should come, not from the voice of man, but from a voice beyond that of man. Should not the church, then, have a right to speak on the issues of our time? Yet when it does speak, we sometimes feel that it is getting out of its sphere. Should not the church speak on the extension of legalized gambling into our community recreation? Should the church not be able to speak on the issue of race? A few months ago when a church group undertook to speak on the issue of recognition of Red China, a howl of protest was heard from an opposing branch of the church. Should the church then be silent because there is opposition?

The Mennonite church, too, suffers from a dilution of its message, from the desire to be popular, from the urge to grow in numbers, from an aversion to being classed as a peculiar sect. Four hundred years ago our church fathers suffered imprisonment, torture, and death for the things which they believed. Ever since that time there have been frequent migrations of church members seeking lands in which they would have freedom to worship God and follow the practices which they believed to be right. Now these same principles and doctrines for which our fathers sacrificed are being considered secondary in importance. In our desire to gain in numbers we hesitate to make these beliefs a condition for church membership. It is time that our own church leaders face realistically the issue as to whether these beliefs are a vital part of the Christian Gospel, or

merely something traditional among our people, something which is good but not essential. If we continue to feel that a mission program is handicapped by these beliefs, and consequently they should not be emphasized, if we continue to make them an optional matter for church membership, if we continue to act as if we believe these matters to be a adjunct to rather than a part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, then it can be only a generation or two until there will no longer be any excuse for the Mennonite church to exist as a separate body, for it will no longer have a unique function, it will no longer have a unique message for our world. At present our reason for a separate existence seems to be going by default. We should face up realistically to the situation and decide candidly whether or not that for which our church fathers suffered and died was an essential part of the Gospel, a secondary matter, or a mistaken idea on their part, no longer useful or vital in our generation.

As Christians, and as graduates of a Christian college, we hope and pray that you will not permit yourself to be squeezed into the world's mold. We hope that after the education you have had, you will stand. This will not be easy. The pressures to conformity are strong. Some of you have lived lives so sheltered that you scarcely know what these pressures will be. You will be tempted to feel that the principles on which you have been reared are out of fashion, and you will be urged to adopt a so-called sophisticated way of life. In your personal lives may you abide by the principles of honesty, purity, temperance, and Christian love. This will not be easy, and to live by these principles will require the whole armor of God, just as it did for the Ephesians. For the struggle is a spiritual one, a struggle against the powers of evil.

We would hope that some of you would not only live Christian personal lives, but that you would see it as a part of your Christian duty to champion great causes. With entrenched evil in the world, only through courageous leadership can that evil be overcome. Martin Luther King has said that when the history of this period is written, the noticeable thing will be "not so much the noise of the wicked as the appalling silence of the good." The forces of evil are aggressive in promoting the wrongs from which they profit materially. Vested interests speak out for the maintenance of privilege. Unless good men and women, motivated by love, justice, and a devotion to Christian standards of morals and ethics, are willing to champion the right, evil will increase. It is people like you, with Christian commitment and a college education, who should take the lead in this fight against the entrenched forces of prejudice and wickedness.

Let us have no illusions about it, those who champion such causes will not thereby become popular. This was never true, and is even less true in an age which cherishes and prizes conformity. Our fathers who suffered and died for their beliefs are lauded in our day, but in their own time they were fugitives not only from the law, but also from a citizenry which thought they should suffer for their effrontery in supporting unpopular causes and opposing the constituted authorities and champions of privilege of their day. A generation which is reminded of its sins and shortcomings is not likely to thank those who have pronounced judgment upon them. We revere those who suffered for conscience' sake in a past age, but we see no reason why folks in our age need to make a fuss about things which we like as they are. We have respect for those reformers who started movements which culminated in the removal of great social evils such as slavery, but we have little time to commend those who stand out from the crowd to point out our own evils. Daughters and sons of some revolutionaries of past days are proud of their ancestry, but these same sons and daughters go to great lengths to discourage any revolutionary ideas among their own offspring. The Christian and the church have a duty to comfort the afflicted and afflict those who have become too comfortable and complacent.

I am sometimes personally concerned that I have held the same position for more than twenty years. It sometimes seems to me that if I had been as active as I should have been in tantalizing people and pricking their consciences concerning Christian education in our day, they would have taken action to eradicate the source of their affliction. The question which you must constantly face in life is not how long you hold a position, but how effective you are in promoting the right while holding that position.

We hope that you will use your talents and your education in breaking from the pressures of the "lonely crowd" to champion worthy causes, to help suppress evils and create influences for good. We are in need of capable people who are willing, if necessary, to make nuisances of themselves, to become fanatics for that which is good and against that which is evil. Only with such leadership can progress be made. There may be evils in your community, such as the encroachment of gambling, either legalized or illegal, centers of temptation for adolescents and young people, perhaps purveyors of indecent literature which is corrupting youth. Perhaps your community will need a swimming pool, or a center for wholesome recreation for youth, or other civic improvements which will not be secured unless some farsighted, intelligent individual such as you is

willing to incur the displeasure of those who can always be counted upon to oppose progress, especially if it costs money to promote it. You should be an individual who is not willing to be squeezed into the mold of the inactive or those with vested interests, but who will be willing to support and initiate those projects and activities which will help to build better communities.

As a graduate from a Christian college you should also depart from the crowd to take and support those viewpoints on the larger problems of our world which will help to build a better world, even if these positions be unpopular ones. We cannot mention many such problems, but by way of illustration we will mention three.

I am personally firmly convinced that the problem of alcohol is one of the basic problems in the United States, and that at the base of this problem is the acceptance and popularity of social drinking. The industry is firmly established in our society, not only because of those who are accustomed to using the beverages, but also because of the vast industry which makes and distributes them and the newspapers, magazines, television and radio stations which are supported by advertising of the product. Inhibitions, such as those of sex, are lowered even by relatively small amounts of alcohol. A driver becomes a dangerous driver even as the result of taking only a few drinks. A large proportion of the deaths resulting from traffic accidents are the result of drinking. Coleman, in his text on abnormal psychology, gives an estimate, more conservative than some, of 3,500,000 excessive drinkers in the United States, of whom three quarters of a million are alcoholics who cannot face life without alcohol.[12] Thirteen and two tenths per cent of all first admissions to mental hospitals are the result of drinking. One must admit that a social drink may in itself do no harm, yet social drinking stands at the base of all results of alcohol. Without the first drink, the evil results of alcohol would not follow. The first drink is almost invariably the social drink. Thus, the one who innocently sips a cocktail is placing his influence on the side of that which destroys and kills. Having done all, stand. Don't let the world squeeze you into its mold.

A second problem is that of racial prejudice. So much has been said about it that there is no need to comment at length. It has been relatively easy, here on the campus, to stand for racial equality. What will you do when you get in groups that have a different viewpoint? Will you stand for that which is right or will you fit into the mold

12 James C. Coleman, *Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life* (Scott, Foresman and Company, 1956) p. 399.

of the crowd? If one of another race seeks to buy a home in your neighborhood, will you join the clamor to drive him out, or will you welcome him as a Christian brother? If you become a superintendent of a public school in need of a teacher, will you draw racial lines in choosing your teaching personnel, or will you recommend the best person available, regardless of color or race?

The third issue which I should like to consider is that of war and peace. The current trend is to think of armed might as a necessity and the first line of defense against communism and its attendant evils. Will you, without thought, be squeezed into that mold, or will you think for yourself? Will you be creative enough and brave enough to suggest other ways which will go further toward maintenance of peace and good will than armed might? Will you be willing to openly question the ethics of spending millions of dollars to get a man into space in order to win a propaganda race, while funds seem inadequate to properly care for men on the earth? Sir John Cockcroft, head of Britain's atomic research program, is quoted as saying that the "thousands of millions being spent by the United States and Russia to get a man into space is not warranted." The *Christian Century* editorial which quoted this statement also said editorially that the project will not be of any great use to humanity, whereas the results of money spent on medical and biological study could be of immediate and great benefit. "The real issue between ourselves and Russia is which will be the first to produce a social order that best preserves and extends civilization on this earth—civilization as expressed in living people."[13]

Do you really believe that the way of violence is the Christian way? Do you believe that Jesus meant what He said when He said that we should love our neighbors as ourselves? If you really believe it, are you willing to stand on that belief, or will you be squeezed into the world's mold?

These are but illustrative of many problems which challenge the thinking of one who is willing to face issues as a Christian and think for himself. If what you want in life is ease and comfort, if you would merely like to slumber on, undisturbed by the alarm clocks of our time, then be a conformist, even though the crowd of which Reisman speaks may be a lonely crowd. However, there is no challenge in that kind of life. If you really want the thrills of life, get out into the rapids. Try rowing upstream instead of just going with the current. Then life will be meaningful, even though it may be rugged. Then you will grow in spirit, even though you may sometimes meet great

13 *The Christian Century,* May 13, 1959, p. 572.

discouragements. Then life can really be worthwhile and meaningful, and when your summons comes to go up higher, you will have left the world a little better because you have been here.

I could do no better than to close with the Scripture with which we began. "Don't let the world squeeze you into its mold, but let God remold your minds from within, so that you may prove in practice that of the plan of God for you is good, meets all His demands and moves toward the goal of true maturity." Or in the words of Paul to the Ephesians, "In conclusion, be strong—not in yourselves but in the Lord, in the power of His boundless resource . . . that even when you have fought to a standstill you may still stand your ground," or "Having done all, to stand."

HUTTERITES REVISIT EUROPEAN HOMESTEADS

(Continued from page 322)

Hans and Margaret had heard much about the model schools in Vienna; so they strongly wanted to study their educational system since they at Cotswold Bruderhof had just finished building two schools for the children of the brotherhood. Thus the next morning Michel Vetter and Margaret went to visit some of these famous Viennese schools. Afterwards we all went to the Library [Nationalbibliothek] to look for books or manuscripts dealing with our forefathers. And indeed, we found several such books, and Hans and Margaret planned to copy from them the next day.

August 20, 1937. We left Vienna and started on our way back home. Hans, however, fell ill and had to stay behind with Margaret. So we took leave of them and went toward Switzerland and Paris.

RESEARCH NOTES

Joachim Helm's Letter Concerning Anabaptists

Gustav Kawerau, in his article, "Zur Reformationsgeschichte Augsburgs," in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. II (Erlangen, 1896) pp. 131 f., prints the text of a letter by Joachim Helm in Augsburg to Sebastian Weiss in Zerbst on March 7, 1528, in which he complains about the heresies current in Augsburg. It is of value for its reference to the Anabaptists in the city.

"Lieber Swaker, ir solt wissen, das es nach ubel zcusteyt by uns, dan grosse ketzerey yst bey uns, funfferley secten: etliche predigen, es sey Christus keyn godt gewest, sunder eyn prophet [see Article 11 of the "Nicolsburger" Articles], die andern sagen, das brot oder Sacrament sey nicht Cristus leib und bludt, etliche teuffen yderman widder, darnach seind die Luterysche und papisten, und ist eyn solcher jammer, das die gantz stadt Auspurgk betrubt ist." He says that a host of people are daily beheaded in Augsburg, and that night and day two hundred guards must keep watch that a riot does not ensue. "Es seind die widderteuffer sso unsinnich, das sie selber, auch frawen und juncfrawen dem tode entkegen lauffen, dreyhundert die kopffe abgeslagen, zungen ausgebrochen, aus der stadt ewych verwyset." The town clerk, Dr. Peutinger, is said to have reported that in Augsburg, Worms, Speyr, Strasbourg, Munich, Regensburg, Ingolstadt, and Vienna, four and a half thousand had been beheaded.

"Wan ein widderteuffer oder ein Zwingelscher bey uns predigt, so seyn by sechzentausent zcuhoren, wan die andern doctores predigen, seindt yr kaum sechs oder siebin mensche auffs meysthe." It is to be lamented, the writer continues, that we are all killing and stabbing one another; the imperial cities are nearly all full of soldiers; even the noblemen daily kill many enthusiasts, but it does no good, for the more one kills, the more will arise, which must be a peculiar plague from God.

Kawerau supplies footnotes to the effect that the numbers in this letter are without doubt grossly exaggerated.

Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart, Indiana WILLIAM KLASSEN

Jantz-Jontzen-Johnson-Yontz and Smith

In his article "I Was a Stranger" in the July 1959 Review, John Schmidt mentioned the two brothers Benjamin and Tobias Jantz of the Mennonite migration from Russia, who went to Elkhart County, Indiana, to earn money "but remained to live, married and reared families there." Eventually Tobias became the Tobias Johnson who married Lavina Smeltzer. These became the parents of a daughter who was later to be Mrs. Floyd Housour of Route 1, Elkhart, Indiana. His brother Benjamin, born in Polish Russia in 1853, was married to Elizabeth Kehr in Elkhart County, Indiana, in 1881. When he died in 1903 his obituary indicated that he was "Benjamin A. Jontzen." The funeral was held in the Yellow Creek Mennonite Church in charge of John F. Funk and other ministers. He left three sons and three daughters, and likely the family is still represented in that Mennonite community. The family did not change its name to Yontz as the Review supposed when its editorial office added a phrase to this effect in the final sentence of the first paragraph of Mr. Schmidt's article.

Elkhart County Mennonite history has illustrations of two additional name changes among the descendants of the Mennonite migration from

eastern Europe during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Henry Jantz and family from near Warsaw, Poland, came to Belleville, Pennsylvania, in 1875. Among the children were Peter, Andrew, Mary, David, and Susana, the latter born at Belleville. After Mrs. Henry Jantz died, the father took the children Peter, David, and Susana to Marion, South Dakota, where he established a home. Mary remained behind in the Belleville community, where she was married and lived the rest of her life. Her descendants are still living in that area. Andrew, too, did not accompany the family to the West but obtained a job working for a Wenger family in Wayne County, Ohio. Here he became engaged to a young Mennonite woman named Smucker, who died of typhoid fever two weeks previous to the wedding date. Her cousins Jonas, Rufus, and Enos Hartzler of Elkhart County, Indiana, attended the funeral and at that time invited Andrew to come to Indiana, which he did. Later he was married to the Hartzler boys' sister Cassey.

As a result of Andrew's settlement in Elkhart County, his brother David moved to this area, where he was married to Emma Yoder of Goshen, in 1898. For thirty-two years David (d. 1958) served as deacon in the Clinton Frame Mennonite Church in Elkhart County. His son Amos is presently serving as deacon in the Benton Mennonite Church of the same county. Many years ago the brothers Andrew and David changed the spelling of their name to "Yontz", the form still followed by their descendants in Indiana. Their brother Peter who moved to western Canada retained the spelling of "Jantz", which is still used by his descendants.

Their sister Susana was married to John Schmidt at Avon, South Dakota, and to them were born five children. Later the mother and her five children lived for five years with her brother-in-law Cornelius Schmidt of Dalmeny, Saskatchewan. Finally the two Yontz brothers of Indiana invited their sister Mrs. Schmidt and her five children to join them in Indiana. On August 24, 1909, the mother and children ranging in age from five to twelve arrived at Topeka, Indiana, where they made their home with her brother Andrew Yontz. When the Schmidt children started to school their teacher told them that "Schmidt" was "Smith" in America and that they ought to spell it the American way. This they at once agreed to do and they have been "Smiths" ever since that day. When young Simon Smith reached the age of seventeen he began working for J. S. Yoder, who took an interest in the lad and predicted that he would some day be a business man. This interest in the young man gave him the inspiration which helped make Simon Smith one of the successful Mennonite business men of Goshen, Indiana.

This account illustrates not only the manner in which Mennonite family names have become changed but also how during the past eighty years there have been intermarriages and cultural exchanges between the older American Mennonite stock of Swiss and German background and those of the Dutch-Prussian-Russian background who came to America after 1873. Stories similar to the above could be duplicated in many of the older American Mennonite communities. (Based in part on an interview with Simon Smith.)

Goshen College MELVIN GINGERICH

Studies in Church Discipline. Mennonite Publication Office: Newton, Kansas, 1958. Pp. 242. $2.00 (Paper cover).

The statement by the President of the General Conference Mennonite Church, Erland Waltner, in his Preface to this stimulating volume will serve to introduce it better than any words of a reviewer could possibly do: "While the very word discipline tends to go against the grain of the modern emphasis on individual freedom, serious study of the Word of God would indicate that here freedom and discipline are not opposites but complements." The volume is divided into three main sections: a series of nine essays under the heading *Vision,* nine additional chapters under the topic *Practice,* and finally a valuable section of *Reference Materials* (39 pages) containing Study Aids, Statistical Data on Discipline Practices in the General Conference Mennonite Church congregations, Guiding Principles for Ministers and Churches, a number of major statements on Nonresistance, Secret Societies, and the Believers' Church, and two indexes. The Introduction informs us that other alternatives than a study manual might have been followed, such as the adoption of an official denominational statement on discipline, or the holding of a study conference on discipline. But it was decided to follow the pattern of a study manual, a book which could be put into the hands of individuals and groups with the hope that it would deepen conviction for and give guidance in the practice of a Biblical church discipline. The preparation of this volume was arranged for by a study committee on church discipline, the authority for which came ultimately from the executive committee of the General Conference Mennonite Church.

The unusually rich study material of the volume is evident from the authors and chapter titles. Under *Vision* one finds: J. N. Smucker, "The Disciplined Life," C. J. Dyck, "Love Working through People," Henry Poettcker, "The New Testament Community," C. J. Dyck, "Early Ideas of Authority," Robert Kreider, "Brotherly Discipline by the Early Swiss," Cornelius Krahn, "Menno and Discipleship," Harold W. Buller, "Transformed in Nonconformity," Marvin Ewert, "Personality and Discipline," and A. E. Kreider, "Standards with Love." The nine essays under *Practice* are as follows: Jacob T. Friesen, "Where Do We Begin?" Henry Poettcker, "Marriage and Divorce," Esko W. Loewen, "Healing Racial Divisions," H. A. Fast, "Right Conduct for Ministers," Jacob W. Nickel, "Business Ethics and Scriptural Teaching," David Schroeder and Esko W. Loewen, "Loyalty and Lodges," Albert M. Gaeddert, "Life Without Liquor," O'Ray C. Graber, "Leisure's New Meaning," and L. R. Amstutz, "A Spiritual Day of Rest." The chapters are well prepared, and they reflect an honest effort to stand squarely in the Anabaptist tradition of loyalty to the Scriptures. Limitations of space will not permit an evaluation of each of these fine essays. Only a few limited remarks will be made.

C. J. Dyck, Professor Elect in the Mennonite Biblical Seminary of Elkhart, writes effectively on the great subject of love. He states that "Perhaps future historians will not refer to our age as the age of the atom after all, but as the Age of the Mass Man or the Age of the Shriveled Soul because we are content simply to live and let live." This is a profound insight into the sin of our lovelessness. Henry Poettcker, the new president of the Canadian Mennonite Bible College, has two excellent chapters in the book. His conclusions on I Corinthians 5:5 (p. 33) do not happen to be identical with the views of C. J. Dyck (p. 46), but this is

not a serious difference, and such minor disagreements are apt to appear in a composite volume. It might have been desirable for Cornelius Krahn to cite the 1956 *Complete Writings of Menno Simons* for the text of the Wismar Articles of 1554 rather than the Anna Brons German volume of 1912 (p. 67). Even more puzzling is his assertion concerning the Anabaptists (he has just quoted Hans Denk), that "Discipleship and discipline were inseparable for them; words with the same root" (p. 65). Is it not the case that in German the two words were *Nachfolge* and *Zucht* (or *Gemeindezucht*)? In the German tongue at least, the language of Denk, there is no common root for the two words. One of the few places in the book that a person in the Anabaptist tradition would raise his eyebrows is in Marvin Ewert's discussion of man's moral impotence (pp. 101-103). This sounds more like a Luther than a Grebel or a Menno: ". . . people are bound to do that which they do." In the reviewer's judgment this is a serious overstatement, although it is true that man is sinful by nature and in need of divine regeneration. (And even if this were true of the unregenerated sinner, what relevance would it have for the discipline of a regenerated member of the body of Christ?) This is of course no denial of the many fine insights of the chapter. Many Mennonites in various groups will appreciate Jacob T. Friesen's endorsements of the long pastorate (p. 129), but the more strict groups will raise questions about giving communion to the persistent sinner (p. 123). Poettcker struggles manfully through the touchy topic of divorce and remarriage (pp. 137-151), although the reviewer is inclined to feel that his vigorous defense of the indissolubility of marriage, laudable as his motives certainly are, hardly does justice to the exceptive clause which feel from the lips of our Lord, or at least with the exceptive clause which the Greek text of Matthew's Gospel says that Jesus uttered. (Poettcker argues that it is an interpolation, although he admits that there are no textual grounds for this assumption.) The most disappointing aspect of Poettcker's discussion is his failure to declare himself on the eligibility for church membership of divorced and remarried converts. Or is it legitimate to conclude that his phrase "so to forgive and accept" (p. 151) means "to accept as members of the church, even though it was a sin to get a divorce and an additional sin to remarry under any and all circumstances while the former mate lives"? It would have been desirable for L. R. Amstutz to discuss more fully the relation of the Christian Lord's Day to the Jewish Sabbath. As to the Sabbath before the time of Moses, the evidence is not at all adequate that there was such a holy day of rest, especially in view of the declaration of Nehemiah (8:13, 14) that God gave Israel His holy Sabbath "by the hand of Moses." It is true that Moses grounded the observance of the Sabbath in God's rest after the six creative days, but is this a declaration that the Sabbath was observed or even revealed prior to his own day?

In many ways the most interesting, if not even the most instructive, part of the book is the last section, which is entitled *Reference Materials*. Here the committee describes fourteen "hard cases" which study groups may wish to discuss. The table on p. 212 indicates the acts which were subject to discipline in each of the seven district conferences (the Central and Middle Districts have since merged). Even more revealing is the result of the discipline in terms of percentage of members restored (49%), transferred to other congregations (25%), lost (23%), or other result (4%). In the five year period under review (1950-1955) 376 persons were disciplined for various reasons in the congregations of the General Conference Mennonite Church. Forty-five percent of these were dealt

with on grounds of immoral conduct, while thirty-nine percent of the cases had to do with doctrinal error or departure from Christian faith. The two conferences most active in discipline were the Canadian and Western district conferences. The Central and Eastern districts had but little discipline in the period under review. The larger congregations (300 or more members) proved to be quicker to institute disciplinary action than the smaller churches. Also congregations that until recently had a "free" (unsalaried) ministry were more active in church discipline than those with salaried preachers. On the other side may be mentioned that there is some evidence that the congregations which have had a supported ministry for two or three decades are more active in this area than those which still have a selfsupported preacher.

The executive committee of the General Conference Mennonite Church deserves warm commendation for taking steps which led to the preparation of this stimulating volume. Surely the Mennonite Brethren and the Mennonite Church (M.C.) ought to make similar studies. Possibly young doctoral candidates or research organizations in the Mennonite Brethren and Mennonite colleges could gather much of the statistical data for the volumes which these groups should sponsor. In the meanwhile every active pastor and interested member should procure and study carefully this well-prepared and valuable study guide. Congratulations to the several contributors and a hearty Thank You to the publisher.

Goshen College Biblical Seminary J. C. WENGER

Socinianism in Poland: The Social and Political Ideas of the Polish Antitrinitarians in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. By Stanislaus Kot. Translated from the Polish by Earl Morse Wilbur. Beacon Hill, Boston: Starr King Press, 1957. PP. xxvii + 226.

In a study of mine entitled "The Encounter of Anabaptists and Mennonites with Anti-Trinitarianism" (*MQR,* XXII, 1948, pp. 139-162), I tried to isolate the known facts concerning those encounters within all three major groups of Anabaptism (Swiss, Dutch, and Hutterite). When discussing in particular such "Encounters" between the Hutterites in Moravia and the Polish Brethren in adjacent Poland (*ibid.* 155 to end) I also referred briefly to a study in the Polish language by Professor Stanislaus Kot (note 56) concerning the political and social ideology of the Polish Brethren, published in Warsaw in 1932, of which I learned from E. M. Wilbur's great *History of Unitarianism* (Harvard University Press, 1946), and which, to my regret, I was not able to use because of language barriers. I am now exceedingly happy to announce and to review an English translation of this basic research work by Professor Kot (formerly of the University of Cracow, Poland, but now living in Paris), and we owe a word of thanks to the late Professor Wilbur for translating this work, splendidly to be sure, and to the Starr King Press. They have all rendered a great service not alone to the cause of their own denominational history but also the cause of the history of the Left Wing of the Reformation in general and to the clarification of the Hutterite-Polish Church conversation and controversy.

Basically it should appear strange that ultra-rationalist "Arians" and the ultraconservative and orthodox Hutterites should have anything in common one way or another. In fact we know from the study by Henry A. DeWind (*MQR,* January 1955) that Italian Anti-Trinitarians lived quite close to the Hutterites in Moravia (i.e., in Austerlitz), and yet one

hears of practically no contacts between these two so differently minded sectarian groups. On the contrary, in my 1948 study I claimed that at least three times Polish Brethren contacted Hutterites in Moravia and three times these attempts failed. Today, on the ground of the elaborate research of Professor Kot we may safely say that such contacts occurred not three times but eight or nine times, and for a while there was a great deal of mutual visiting, something quite unexpected and surprising. Kot's research is, however, convincing and profound, a beautiful work of genuine European scholarship of the first rank.

It cannot be the intention of this present review to discuss at greater length the major ideas of this profound work concerning the social and political ideas of the Polish Anti-Trinitarians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A brief and very clear summary of these ideas was placed by Kot in the front of the 1957 translation of the work which he calls "Introduction" (pp. ix-xxvii), actually an adaptation of a public lecture by Kot in London before the Unitarian Historical Society in May 1955 and in part published in the *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society* of London, 1956. Here, on eighteen pages, we learn the main results of Kot's lifelong study of that material; e.g., that the term "Socinianism" (after Faustus Socinus) was not coined until the seventeenth century, and that Socinus himself, though living in Poland from 1579, was not admitted at all to the ecclesiastical community of the Polish Brethren because of differences in certain interpretations. Polish Arianism, then, so we learn, was an indigenous product of "liberal" and "humanistic" Christianity in Poland itself and might be followed back to an inconspicuous event in 1556, when a Polish student and later lector of Logics at the University of Padua, by the name of Peter Giezek, from Goniazd (Latinized Peter Gonesius), expounded the ideas of Michael Servetus to a Calvinistic synod (p. xi). Strangely enough, and in spite of much ado, a number of Calvinist pastors felt an appeal in Peter's "Six Points" and thus formed on the spot the nucleus of the first Unitarian organization in Europe.

Actually the story can be followed still further back to Padua, where Peter Gonesius had been both a student and a lector; there one of his professors exposed him to secretly circulating ideas of Servetus, a most decisive event for Peter. He now became the foremost protagonist of these ideas wherever he went independently of the activities of the two Socini elsewhere in Italy. On his way back from Padua to Poland, Peter crossed Moravia and visited some of the Hutterite Bruderhofs. His sensitive and youthful mind was profoundly impressed by what he saw (the year being 1555, just about the beginning of the "Golden Period" of the Hutterites; Peter Riedemann died in 1556). Some of their tenets appealed strongly to Peter as being absolutely in accordance with the Gospel; namely, (*a*) the opposition to infant baptism and the insistence on adult baptism as the sealing of the new covenant; (*b*) the nonresistant attitude of absolute peacefulness (carrying wooden sticks instead of a sword, etc.), which has implications concerning the relationship to the state, no genuine Christian being able to become a magistrate; and (*c*) the communal way of living in Bruderhof colonies in which both production and consumption are carried on in common. When Peter returned and established the first "Arian" congregatiion in Poland, these three principles became their guiding principles in spite of doctrinal differences otherwise. Of this 1555 visit nothing is recorded in Hutterite Chronicles and we are very grateful for this information.

When we leaf through Professor Kot's book it appears as if, like a red

thread, a recurring motif were running through the entire story: conversation and controversy between Polish "Arians" and Hutterites concerning mutual "learning" from each other and possibly final fusion, actually an absurd idea in view of the fact that the Hutterites were extremely orthodox in their doctrinal outlook and the Arians ultra-liberal. But for one full century, 1555 to 1654, such contacts existed, both personal and literary, beginning with Peter Gonesius and ending one hundred years later with the strange "conversion" to Hutterianism of Dr. Daniel Zwicker of Danzig. (See the article "Zwicker" in Volume IV of the *Mennonite Encyclopedia*. Because the Polish Brethren accepted the principle of adult baptism as proposed by Gonesius, Kot is occasionally led to call them "Anabaptists," which unfortunately only confuses the issues.[1]) We cannot report here in detail all the ups and downs of the Polish-Moravian contacts, but one particular detail is significant enough to call attention to it. In 1568 the Polish Brethren, strongly attracted by the comunal life of the Moravians whom so many had visited, decided to study the practical details of such a life in all their ramifications, and for that purpose dispatched four young men as "apprentices" to one such Bruderhof for a full year, needless to say with the full consent of the mission-minded Hutterites. When the year was over the four young Poles, rather disappointed with the hard life and the strict discipline of the Hutterites, returned to Poland and submitted their report. Thereupon an anonymous tract was drawn up by the faction of the Polish Brethren Church which had been unsympathetic to the idea from the very beginning; it was most likely written by Stanislaus Budzynski (Kot, p. 40) and was entitled "A Treatise . . . Against Such as One of Those Sects Wished to Recommend . . . Called Communists in Moravia, Outside of Which (as they say) There is no Salvation" (1569; original at the University Library of Leyden, Netherlands). Professor Kot treated this particular event not only in his study, "Polish Brethren and the Problem of Communism in the Sixteenth Century" (*Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, London, xii, 1956) but also published an English translation of the tract (*Transactions*, 1957).[2] Kot calls this document of "first rate importance, for it represents the oldest critique in Poland of the communist system," vital though this system had been for the Arian church since its very beginning. The tenor of the treatise is, as a matter of fact, rather unfair and misses the major idea behind Hutterite communism, speaking constantly of "hypocrisy" and "contrivances" of those "good managers" who practice "plunder of others' goods and labor," etc. It is important to know that Budzynski had never been in Moravia but relied entirely upon the report of the four young apprentices.

In spite of such slanderous propaganda contacts did not end, as we well know from the Hutterite Chronicle and other sources. There were now two opposing factions within the "Little" Polish Church, and the experimentation with a sort of practical communism of goods continued. In 1605 a Hutterite, Joseph Hauser, a barber-surgeon or physician, wrote a new defense of their communal life, entitled *Unterrichtung, dass die Gemeinschaft der zeitlichen Güter eine Lehr des Neuen Testamentes sei* (to be published in full by Lydia Müller and Robert Friedmann in

1 In a recent paper in the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XLIV (1958) Professor Kot speaks expressly of the "Wiedertäufer in Wilna," meaning of course the Unitarians of that city. Anabaptist scholars can only regret this particular use of the term "Wiedertäufer" or Anabaptist as it obfuscates the true situation and function of evangelical Anabaptism.

2 We hope to be able to publish excerpts of its main contents later in the *MQR* as a "picture of the Bruderhofs as seen by critical outsiders," together with other contemporary reports.

Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Täufer, Vol. II). Promptly a Polish Brother (actually a German), Valentine Smalcius, refuted this tract in a polemic no longer in existence. Also the well-known Christopher Ostorodt wrote a German tract against the Hutterites, in spite of his generally missionary intentions. Ehrenpreis, much later, replied to this tract in an elaborate rejoinder. And so the story goes on, the last visits of Poles in Moravia taking place in 1608 and 1612. A strange attraction kept these contacts from a complete break. (In 1622 the Moravian Anabaptists were expelled and then contacts almost stopped.)

Finally Kot raises a very pertinent question concerning the basic difficulties existing between these two sectarian groups. Of course, for the Hutterites the issue was clear from the very beginnings of these contacts: orthodoxy can never mix with liberalism and latitudinarianism. If the Poles truly want to join they are welcome, but only on the ground of a complete confession of faith in accord with Trinitarian belief.[3] But what about the Poles, the aggressive partners in this encounter? I think that Kot is right in seeking and finding the very root of these difficulties not primarily in the different theological doctrines, important though they were, but in the different social levels represented in Poland and Moravia. The Moravians, we read, were recruited primarily from the lower strata of the middle class, i.e., artisans or craftsmen and peasant-farmers (hardly laborers in the later sense of the term), people ready for hard work and the acceptance of a rigid discipline. Even those who had formerly held other jobs (as, e.g., the apothecary Melchior Platzer of Rankweil, Vorarlberg) had to learn a craft in the Bruderhof. This was simply the rule. (Compare the relevant article, "Social Background of the Anabaptists," in Volume IV of the *Mennonite Encyclopedia.*) The Poles, on the contrary, belonged to a large extent to the lower stratum of the nobility, the "gentry," who were used to a multitude of servants, and to the intellectuals of Poland, who likewise detested manual labor. (Zwicker was a physician, and Simon Ronemberg was an apothecary, etc.) Obviously, these two groups could not favor a Bruderhof type of life, attractive though it had always been for the Polish Brethren.

We read that two more problems bothered the young Arian Church a great deal, apparently insoluble and yet urgent: the relationship to the state and the question of war. Peter Gonesius once seemed to have been clear at least concerning the second issue, nonresistance being the true Christian answer. But what about the position of this church at a later, more settled date? No real agreement could be achieved on this or the "state" issue. "It may seem hard to understand," writes Kot, "why there were so many changes and hesitations, ranging from the social and anti-state radicalism of the 'anarchists' of Rakow [1609] to [the later] complete approval of the state and the social order." Then answer is again found in the social structure of the Polish Church rather than in its religious roots: its "gentry" found it impossible to follow in the footsteps of the radical German or Dutch Anabaptists. And thus gradually the incipient radicalism of the Poles was transformed (unconsciously and unnoticed, most likely) into a decent humanitarianism (p. 214), a trait characteristic of present-day Unitarianism.

Originally the Polish Brethren were averse to the state, a symbol and result of evil in the world. But it was soon recognized that in a "gentry state" one could not survive without fulfilling obligations to this state—

3 Dr. Daniel Zwicker actually made such a confession in 1654, but with a "mental reservation" as to the validity of this confession. One year later he was no longer a "Hutterite," but not a Polish Brother either. One wonders why Ehrenpreis, the bishop of that time, accepted such a confession.

and thus the road to compromise was thrown wide open. In the long run, however, it was of little avail. When the Swedish invasion of Poland began (1655-1660), the Polish Brethren found themselves in a grave dilemma and predicament. The Polish Diet solved it for them: in 1658 all Unitarians were banished from Poland, and by 1660 nearly all had emigrated to Silesia, Transylvania, and the Netherlands. But that begins another story not so unknown to the Mennonites.

This is a historical work of the first order, and we owe Dr. Kot many thanks for his labor of love, which not only clarifies an important chapter of the story of the Unitarians, but which also sheds new light on the history of the Moravian Anabaptists and their problems. A welcome index closes the volume.

Kalamazoo, Michigan ROBERT FRIEDMANN

Temporal and Eternal. By Charles Pierre Peguy. Translated by Alexander Dru. New York: Harper, 1958. Pp. 159. $3.50.

This carries the reader into the troubled world of France's Dreyfuss affair about the turn of the last century. To understand the concrete detail of Peguy's work requires considerable historical knowledge of that period. In a sense, however, these details are incidental to the real meaning of the two essays which comprise this book.

For the past few decades scholars in the field of religion have employed and refined the analytical categories set up by Ernst Troeltsch for the study of stages and types in Christian groupings, namely church, sect, and mysticism (*Kirche, Sekt and Mystik.*) Moved by quite other considerations, and without the scholarly precision of Troeltsch, Peguy works with contrasts which seem even more suggestive. With reference to the religious and political movements bound up with the Dreyfus affair, he employs the simple polarities of *politique* and *mystique,* of temporal and eternal. His purpose is immediate and practical, however, rather than abstract or scholarly.

Peguy is a man of passionate and romantic faith, moving in his lifetime through a wide arc of social and religious views. Through it all he is fervently French, and in the end his nationalism becomes sort of a precursor of fascism. The polarities of which he speaks are not primarily those of social types, such as *Kirche* and *Sekt,* or of stages between them—terms which he of course does not use, but the threat of every historical embodiment to the ideal which inspires it. Applied to *Kirche-Sekt* problems, this would mean, if one were to follow the implications of Peguy's thought, that the attempt of the *Sekt* to realize purity in contrast to the adulteration of the *Kirche* is not the real issue. It is rather a question of how any movement, and especially the *Sekt,* can escape the betrayal of its own ideals.

Churchmen are often tempted to ignore the critique of the social scientists, since the church by the theological definition is a "sacred" entity rooted in the Holy Spirit or "beyond history." Not all that these scientists say deserves to be taken seriously. But the moment Christian belief assumes social expression it enters the domain of social "laws' operating whereever human groups exist. Though one may expect that the Holy Spirit will transmute these "laws" or forces, there is nothing to be gained by assuming that the Spirit nullifies them. Much of what Peguy says, repels. But the perspectives which he opens on the question of old skins and new wines which we perpetually face in Christian history, deserve to be pondered long.

Tokyo, Japan PAUL PEACHEY

*Histoire du Protestantisme en Belgique aux xvii*me *et xviii*me *siecles.* By Robert Collinet: Tome II of the series, "Histoire du Protestantisme en Belgique et au Congo Belge," Librairie des Eclaireurs Unionistes, Bruxelles, 1959. Pp. 255, 75 BFr.

This volume by Collinet moves on from his similar survey of the Reformation period (reviewed in *MQR,* April 1959) to cover the history of Protestantism in Belgium from the close of the sixteenth century (which coincides roughly with the definitive partition of the Netherlands) to the close of the eighteenth, with the antireligious efforts of the French revolutionary governments which subjugated Belgium in 1792. This is a time during which Protestantism in Belgium is for all practical purposes limited to such manifestations of its existence as can be supported by the Calvinists across the borders to the north. Churches continue to exist where there are Dutch merchants in major cities, where there are Dutch military garrisons, and in enclaves under Dutch civil administration. Little of their history has been recorded beyond that involved in their struggle for survival in the face of social and political discrimination. Collinet does about all one could expect in the way of a survey of these meager sources for the lay reader. The book is written on the same level as the earlier volume, but will probably find less use as a text for secondary school religion courses because of the lesser significance of its subject matter.

The book is closed unexpectedly by a chapter on "The Disappearance of the Belgian Mennonites," in the preparation of which Collinet was assisted by his publisher, Jules Lambotte. Leaning heavily on the work of A. L. E. Verheyden, Lambotte follows the last traces of Mennonitism in Belgium from 1588 (definitive restoration of the Spanish dominion in Belgium) to 1640-1650 (estimated final emigration of Mennonites to the North). Then he attempts to follow the further history of the Flemish emigrants in the Northern Netherlands and North Germany, using as guides both the controversies between the "Flemish" and the "Frisian" parties (though in the recognition that these designations soon ceased to be of primarily geographical significance) and the classification of family names. Besides certain congregations specifically designated as Walloon and a few individuals bearing French names, Lambotte indentifies as Flemish in origin such names as Apostool, Claesen, Cornelis, Craen, van Daele, Dyck, van Eeghem, van der Leyen, van der Meulen, and van der Smissen (nothing is said of the degree of certainty with which these names prove the Flemish origin of those who bear them; some of the more common of them could be found in Flanders without being uniquely Flemish). Hans de Ries (born in Antwerp) and the founder of the Apostool line were probably the Flemish emigrants of the greatest significance for the Dutch Mennonitism of the time.

This modest and somewhat uneven, but well-presented work will serve well such need as exists within Belgian Protestantism. One may hazard the guess that no other standard work on Protestant history for this period gives the Mennonites so much attention, or advertises the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* and the works of Horsch, Smith, Wenger, and Friedmann.

Elkhart, Indiana JOHN H. YODER

Leben und Sterben des Zürcher Täuferführers Felix Mantz. By Ekkehard Krajewski. Kassel: J. G. Oncken, 1956. Pp. 162.

This Zürich doctoral dissertation (under Fritz Blanke, who is establishing himself more and more as *spiritus rector* of Continental Anabaptists studies) attempts to portray the life and work of Feliz Mantz, the close associate of Conrad Grebel and first Anabaptist martyr in Zürich. After an introductory section on the youth and the background of Mantz which emphasizes the humanistic element, Krajewski analyzes in eleven chapters the various phases of Mantz's growing Anabaptist conviction between 1523 and his martyrdom in 1527: we note an initial period of alienation and separation from Zwingli (1523-1524), the attempts of reconciliation (1524-1525), and the beginnings of Anabaptism in Zollikon (1525). The remainder of the book gives a moving account of Mantz's four imprisonments and the intermittent periods of Anabaptist activity near Zürich, his final trial and martyrdom in Zürich in January 1527.

Any researcher on Mantz must labor under the real handicap of limited sources. Krajewski himself concedes (p. 8) that he received negative advice regarding his undertaking. It must have been clear to him that the available source material was hardly sufficient for a book of almost two hundred pages, especially since the author's apparently extensive search in Swiss Archives for new material on Mantz proved to be unsuccessful. Thus the book is a running commentary on the paucity of documentary evidence pertaining to Felix Mantz's life and confirms only at various places throughout the book the nescience of previous scholarship (pp. 21, 59, 107, 121, etc.). The study gives hardly any new insights. Since only little could be said about Mantz, the author says all the more about the early history of Zürich Anabaptism. Here he reveals indeed a good acquaintance with the results of latest scholarship. As satisfactory as his presentation is, in the light of the work of Bergmann (whom Krajewski cites in his bibliography, but does not use!), Köhler, and Blanke, it was hardly necessary.

It is regrettable that Krajewski's industriousness and (unusually) sympathetic understanding of the Anabaptist movement in Switzerland did not find adequate expression in the present volume. Let us hope that his projected second volume, on Mantz's theology, will give him a better opportunity.

Duke University Divinity School HANS J. HILLERBRAND

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIII, 1959

JANUARY

Editorial

Balthasar Hubmaier and the Beginnings of Swiss Anabaptism 5
John H. Yoder

Pilgram Marpeck's Two Books of 1531 18
William Klassen

Leonhard Schiemer and Hans Schlaffer: Two Tyrolean Anabaptist Martyr-Apostles of 1528 31
Robert Friedmann

The Germantown Anti-Slavery Petition of 1688 42
J. Herbert Fretz

The Relationship of the MCC Relief and Service Program and Mennonite Missions 60
Paul N. Kraybill

Anabaptists in Frankfort on the Main 68
Gerhard Hein

Research Notes 72

Remarkable Interdependencies Between Certain Anabaptist Doctrinal Writings
Hans J. Hillerbrand

An Invitation to an Anabaptist Service in Strasbourg in 1539
Harold S. Bender

Book Reviews 77

John A. Hostetler, *God Uses Ink*
Reviewed by Samuel A. Yoder

William I. Schreiber, *The Fate of the Prussian Mennonites*
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender

Grete Mecenseffy, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Oesterreich*
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender

APRIL

Editorial 82

How to Deal With Anabaptists: An Unpublished Letter of Heinrich Bullinger 83
Heinold Fast and John H. Yoder

The Oldest Known Hutterite Codex of 1566: A Chapter in Anabaptist Intellectual History 96
Robert Friedmann

Jacob Wisler and the Old Order Mennonite Schism of 1872 in Elkhart County, Indiana (*Part I*) 108
John C. Wenger

Amish Ministers Conferences 1826-31 132
Harvey J. Miller

A Newly Discovered Pennsylvania Mennonite Petition of 1755 142
Guy F. Hershberger

Research Notes 152

When a People Migrate: Footnote to the Mennonite Migration of the 1870's
John F. Schmidt

Book Reviews 156
Guy F. Hershberger, *The Way of the Cross in Human Relations*
Reviewed by Robert Kreider
Benjamin Heinrich Unruh, *Die niederländisch-niederdeutschen Hintergründe der mennonitischen Ostwanderungen im 16., 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*
Reviewed by N. van der Zijpp and Cornelius Krahn
Paul M. Miller, *Group Dynamics in Evangelism*
Reviewed by Leland Harder
Donald F. Durnbaugh, *European Origins of the Brethren, A Source Book on the Beginnings of the Church of the Brethren in the Early Eighteenth Century*
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender
Robert Collinet, *La Réformation en Belgique au XVIme Siecle*
Reviewed by John H. Yoder

JULY

Editorial 170
The life and Teachings of Hans Hut (*Part I*) 171
Herbert Klassen
The Doctrine of Original Sin as Held by the Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century 206
Robert Friedmann
Jacob Wisler and the Old Order Mennonite Schism of 1872 in Elkhart County, Indiana (*Concluded*) 216
John C. Wenger
Attendance in Mennonite Colleges, 1957-58 241
Silas Hertzler
Research Notes 245
I Was a Stranger
John F. Schmidt
An Experimental Evaluation of the Objectives of a Mennonite College
Frank C. Peters
The Commander
William I. Schreiber
Mennonite Plattdeutsch
Cornelius Krahn
Book Reviews 260
Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of the Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries*
Thomas Gilby, *Between Community and Society. A Philosophy and Theology of the State*
Reviewed by Paul Peachey

OCTOBER

Editorial 266
The Life and Teachings of Hans Hut (*Part II*) 267
Herbert Klassen
Hutterites Revisit European Homesteads: From the Travel Diary of David Hofer 305
Robert Friedmann
Menno Simons and the Role of Baptism in the Christian Life 323
Vincent G. Harding

Christian Nonconformity in a Conformist Age 355
Lloyd L. Ramseyer
Research Notes 347
Joachim Helm's Letter Concerning Anabaptists
William Klassen
Jantz–Jontzen–Johnson-Yontz and Smith
Melvin Gingerich
Book Reviews 349
Studies in Church Discipline
Reviewed by John C. Wenger
Stanislaus Kot, *Socinianism in Poland*
Reviewed by Robert Friedmann
Charles Pierre Peguy, *Temporal and Eternal*
Reviewed by Paul Peachey
Robert Collinet, *Histoire du Protestantisme en Belgique*
Reviewed by John H. Yoder
Ekkehard Krajewski, *Leben und Sterben des Zürcher Täuferführers Felix Mantz*
Reviewed by Hans J. Hillerbrand
Index to Volume XXXIII, 1959 358

Bap. Dis. Sch.